(LEAGUE TRACT XII)

# DR. WHITE

...ON THE...

# WARFARE

...OF...

# Science with Theology

---

BY THE

REV. THOMAS HUGHES, S. J.

---

317 WILLING'S ALLEY

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

204
H874

# DR. WHITE

ON THE

# WARFARE OF SCIENCE

WITH

# THEOLOGY.

---

## CONTENTS.


I. Dr. A. D. White on the Warfare of Science with Theology;

II. The Cornell Historian, or, Dr. A. D. White's Legend about St. Francis Xavier;

III. Dr. White's Evolution: The Genesis and Structure of His Legend;

IV. History at Cornell University: Some Canons of Criticism for Dr. White's Legends.



WOODSTOCK COLLEGE

CANCELED DUPLICATE

WOODSTOCK COLLEGE LIBRARY



BY THE REV. THOMAS HUGHES, S.J.


---


317 WILLING'S ALLEY,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.



ALMA COLLEGE
204
LIBRARY
H874
Los Gatos, Calif.

63441

FROM

"THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW,"

June, July, August, September,

1897.

# I.

# Dr. A. D. White on the Warfare of Science with Theology.

LAST year another work was added to the shelves already groaning under the load of Evolution. It is Dr. Andrew Dickson White's *Warfare of Science with Theology.*[1] These two respectable volumes, containing altogether more than 800 octavo pages, will take their place aside of Professor John W. Draper's production of the *Conflict Between Science and Religion.* The term "religion" in the one has been supplanted by the word "theology" in the other; and the author explains that he means "dogmatic theology."[2] But, what it is that he means by "dogmatic" which he prefixes to "theology," he does not explain; and what it is that he means by "theology" which he affixes to "dogmatic," that likewise he explaineth not. It is possible that he considers both as primeval ideas, to be treated accordingly, as he undertakes to do. He does adorn them largely from the stores of folk-lore.

The work, which is not strikingly original, is adjusted to the capacities of young and unformed minds, as well as of minds that are old but ill-formed. The unbalanced judgments of the one class, and the ill-balanced judgments of the other, are well matched by the qualities which the author exhibits and by the manner in which he uses his materials. Materials undigested and a faculty uncritical have combined

1 *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*, by Andrew Dickson White, LL.D., (Yale), L.H.D., (Columbia), Ph. Dr., (Jena), late president and professor of History at Cornell University. In two volumes. London: Macmillan & Co., ltd. 1896.

2 Introduction, p. ix.

to produce a work quite characteristic of the cultured generation to which the author belongs, and adapted to the purpose of propagating his kind. The offset which might have been furnished against its infidel and corrupting tendencies by the flatness of the writer's style, by the want of equipoise either in his thoughts or his sentences, is more than neutralized by the compensating qualifications of personal assurance and infallible self-assertion. Such qualifications may even strike the clever students in colleges and the smart misses in female academies with more persuasive force than literary abilities; and, imagining that they have been reading science, they will be ready to substitute it for their own good sense. They will find here wherewith to replenish their modest capacities, from the author's magazine of funny stories and ridiculous incidents, at the expense of the Bible and of religion; with sneers, more or less pretentious, at all creeds and instincts of faith; and, above all, they will feel the weight of the erudition congested in the foot-notes.

Some other persons, too, whose mental caliber we should have thought superior to any adjustment contrived by Dr. White, seem to have looked already with some complacency on the kind of ammunition supplied by the gallant author. In a Catholic magazine, which we just now receive for the month of February, a person who talks as a Catholic, and who appears to be speaking seriously about evolution, refers with a degree of gravity to this work of Dr. White's. And, in any case, we are not quite sure whether the straightforward minds of persons seeking self-culture may not be harassed with a number of difficulties, as the circulation of the Doctor's new article extends wider, and a retail trade breaks up the bulk of his big volumes into handy pieces for current barter. Literary clubs, reading circles, summer-schools and the like, are predestined for special favor in the distribution. Not improbably, such good persons will have recourse to theologians or other qualified persons, for answers to questions and enlightenment in difficulties.

We may as well concede, as we do freely, that it would require the succors of extraordinary wisdom to answer all

the questions which a Dr. White can suggest. There are indeed few questions in heaven and earth which he himself does not feel wise enough to settle; and therefore he may ask more of them than a wise man can answer. Still, all that will be necessary for practical purposes will be to ascertain what his erudition is like; what his logic is like; what kind of thing offers itself to our contemplation in his fidelity, his candor, his unquenchable thirst for truth. A few samples will suffice for this. But let them be clear, striking ones. Then, following his own system of argumentation, with however some easy improvements in point of sincerity and fidelity, a person may readily conclude: From one judge all—from these few divine the value of the rest. It is so that prices are oftentimes quoted in the market; and this author's price can be quoted in like manner.

This, we say, will do for practical purposes. More may be desirable, when more is accessible.

## §1.

Last summer there appeared in one of the leading American Reviews an article from the pen of Dr. Kendall Adams, reviewing this new publication.[1] At a glance one could see that the subject of Dr. Adams' eulogy must have been the same long series of articles which had appeared in the pages of the *Popular Science Monthly*, some years ago. They were then entitled "New Chapters in the Warfare of Science." If we remember aright, the praise which Dr. Adams bestowed on the work, now in book form, was unstinted. He remarked particularly how erudite it was, because it contained so many references in foot-notes. To show the indisputable grounds of merit on which the praise was due to the distinguished author, the equally distinguished reviewer selected a brilliant specimen of literary execution, of logical acumen, of vast erudition, of truly philosophical instincts, on the part, in the mind and soul, of

1 *The Forum.* It was sent to us in Italy, and it is not at hand now, to furnish the exact reference.—*Forum.* September, 1896, p. 65, Mr. White's "Warfare of Science with Theology."—Ed.

Dr. A. D. White. The specimen was selected, perhaps impartially, by a learned reviewer; and it was one, which certainly showed the author off at his very best, with quite a power of constructive demonstration as well as of destructive criticism. It was a demonstration in which, not only was the logic of Dr. White fulminating and his rhetoric cogent; but, as we ourselves can aver, there is a touch of poetry about it; and, if the phrasing, or the composition of his sentences generally, might admit of amelioration, it was all unexceptionable here. To show a strong man off, you must show him at his strongest feat. And Dr. Adams' choice did honor to his perspicacity. We would even say that it did honor to his situation.

For, though he is actually president, if we mistake not, of Wisconsin University, he is the latest ex-president of Cornell University. Now, that is what Dr. White himself has the honor of being—an ex-president of Cornell University. He had coöperated with the founder, Mr. Cornell, in the original organization of that institution. And there are other honors which he has borne gracefully in the line of administration. He is gratified to tell us, in his Introduction, that he has three times received appointments from the Federal Government, "first, as a commissioner to Santo Domingo, in 1870; afterward, as minister to Germany, in 1879; finally, as minister to Russia, in 1892." To which might be added the imposing title of "Ambassador to Berlin in 1897." Besides administrative services at Cornell University, he seems to have taken some part in its intellectual culture; for he puts himself down on his title-page as "late professor of history at Cornell University." We had not known this before; and hence we had never descried any relation between the posts he had held or the qualifications he possesses and the literary performance which we have before us. The missing link is now apparent. It is to be seen in the late professorship of history at Cornell University.

But what was the specimen which, to show off the strength of Dr. White, was selected by Dr. Adams as the author's best feat? It was a chapter on the evolution of miracles out of

legend, containing his very remarkable piece of destructive criticism on the miracles attributed to St. Francis Xavier. This achievement was good for what it did ; but better for what it implied and entailed. It was such a striking exposure of a modern case, wherein miracles had been involved "in the warm atmosphere of love and devotion," (we are quoting Dr. White's poetic imagery),[1] that, if a live specimen like this, and one so conspicuous in our days, could be dissected thus, all demonstrations with regard to the history of the miraculous in general might well seem to be superfluous. And in these terms does Dr. White himself conclude his criticism on the account of St. Francis Xavier's miracles, that it "will serve to illustrate the process which in thousands of cases has gone on from the earliest days of the Church until a very recent period."[2] In other words, when the spirit of Dr. White had entered into the history of St. Francis Xavier, all miracles, from the foundation of the Church till now, went with a start, a rush and a run, into some Miltonian "paradise of fools"; just as the herd of animals that were rooting on the shores of Genesareth went tumbling into the lake and drowned themselves, as soon as the spirit of Satan entered them.

We were well acquainted with this very original legend about St. Francis Xavier, even before the author had issued it in book form. We had read it carefully and commented on it, among his "New Chapters in the Warfare of Science." But it was not until it appeared thus that we saw the commanding position which it held in Dr. White's lucubration and in his mental composition. Generally speaking, life is too short, and the circumstances which encompass mortal men are too stringent, to allow of such wanton dissipation as that of pursuing an ex-professor of history through the by-ways of a scientific monthly, or even the highway of two big volumes. We had never read a word of the articles, which had "dragged their long length along," and which, as he tells us, were the outcome of twenty years of his maturity. It was only the article on St. Francis Xavier which, at the

1 Volume II., page 21. 2 Ibid, page 22.

request of the Rev. Fr. Hewitt, we had taken up and analyzed, as a contribution to the venerable editor's own articles on Dr. A. D. White.[1] But the fact, that out of all the mass of matter in the two new volumes, Dr. Adams should have made precisely the choice of this piece for his eulogy in the *Forum*, was a circumstance which began to open our eyes. And soon other circumstances developed which opened them fully.

Meanwhile, there was just one little incidental or inferential trait about the affair, which might cause a nervous twitch of discomfort to a sensitive person. It was that, as St. Francis appeared in the treatment of the *Forum*, the chapter in the book would seem to be none the better for the criticism passed upon the article in the magazine. It was a little painful to find that proofs of his inaccuracies could not penetrate into the dense medium wherein a Dr. White lived, wrought and wrote. But, on the other hand, that was only what might have been expected. Twenty years of condensation in one atmosphere, as well as the traditions and etiquette of the sect to which the author belongs, debarred him utterly from the privilege of receiving a ray of light or of learning aught from profane outsiders. It is a misfortune to which gentlemen of his creed seem willingly to submit; and others ought to submit to it likewise. Still, be it said for the relief of our feelings, it is always a little painful, in spite of theoretic knowledge, to see once more that an unpleasant fact is indeed just so.

We are not of Dr. White's creed. So we learnt something as we moved on. Passing from one foreign country, where Dr. Adams and the *Forum* made us melancholy, to another country, where we thought to shake off all painful reminiscences, we lighted upon an article already printed, in the hands of a learned Bollandist, on the subject of St. Francis Xavier's Miracles and on Dr. Andrew Dickson White.

1 *The Catholic World*, September, 1891, pp. 837–849, "The Popular Science Monthly on Miracles of St. Francis Xavier"; and October, 1891, pp. 20–32, "Dr. A. White on St. Francis Xavier's Gift of Tongues"; reviewing the *Popular Science Monthly*, May, 1891, pp. 3–11, in articles "New Chapters in the Warfare of Science"; xii. "Miracles and Medicine," part i: by Andrew D. White, LL. D., L. H. D.

In this article, which is to be seen in the current number of the *Analecta Bollandiana*,[1] the writer sketches the question from the side of hagiographical criticism; and he notes pertinently that it is no novelty for the authors of the Bollandist *Acta Sanctorum* to apply the tests of stringent criticism to all that professes to be miraculous in the traditional histories of Saints. This remark may surprise Dr. White and that peculiar class of authors whom he copies. The pertinence of it surprises even ourselves; for we should never have thought it necessary to inform historians, and historians who treat of Saints, that the sixty-odd great tomes of the Bollandist Acts of the Saints, dating now from the times of Fr. Vitelleschi and not yet completed after two hundred and sixty years of work, are to be found on the shelves of libraries all over the world, and would supply them with information which they have not yet discovered. But they have not discovered the information, nor do they seem to have discovered the work. Moreover, the learned Bollandist having the volumes of Dr. White in his hands, took note of the fact that the author had read the criticism passed on his former production; that he had taken very special pains; that, as far as appeared in the text of the new book, there must have been some alteration in the Doctor's base of operations; but that the work did not seem to be the better for the alteration. He observed, besides, that the criticism had put the Doctor in very bad humor.

Now all this was very surprising—not that he should have been in bad humor with the criticism or the critic. The divinest minds of paganism, even Juno herself was subject to momentary fits of wrath, which, if she did not immortalize them in foot-notes, won immortality in Virgil's text: *Tantaene animis coelestibus irae!* There was nothing strange about this in the class of minds among which, following strictly the venerable Dr. Milner, we had duly found a place for the mind of Dr. White. Nor was it strange that, being

1 *Analecta Bollandiana*, xvi., pp. 52-63, "Les Miracles de S. François Xavier."

an exquisite gentleman, he should have felt exquisitely nervous at being made to look ridiculous. For this we would gladly apologize, did the responsibility lie with ourselves. But, unfortunately, it lay in our subject; and there we must beg to leave it. In one respect, we may be able to retract. He may have been galled at the supposition, which we had been making throughout, that the author of the articles in the *Monthly* was a scientific man. Since we have read his work, we see that we were mistaken.

What did surprise us, in the first place, was to find that he had read our articles at all; we should have thought that an indiscretion, according to the etiquette of his sect. Secondly, if he had read them, then it surprised us indeed to infer, as we had done from Dr. Adams' review, that he left his thesis in the same erroneous form in which it had sinned, perhaps innocently, while wrapped up as yet in the infant bandages of a magazine article. For, if he had left it so, now that it had attained its adult form of voluminous literature, the erroneous cast of the article must have become simply mendacious in the book—quite a surprising performance for an exquisite gentleman.

We looked at his notes, and at the abuse we received there. It was then we grew interested and looked at his text. Here we made at once such startling discoveries that we thought ourselves bound to go through the whole production of so remarkable a man—through the whole of the two volumes, whereof the chapter on St. Francis Xavier was, according to Dr. Kendall Adams, the recognized chief and champion. Having done all this, we are fond enough to imagine that since others may not be so prodigal of their pleasure in the service of hard duty as a passing sentiment has led us to be, we might be of service to them, by communicating our impressions. For the present, then, let us take up the conception and plan of the work, which we shall follow shortly with a pleasant excursion through the new disquisition on St. Francis Xavier.

What has Dr. White done? That is a difficult question to answer. Let us begin with an easier one. What has led

him to do it? He tells us himself in his Introduction. Having started a university, in connection with Ezra Cornell, and having founded that university on a strictly secular footing, he encountered on the spot a bitter opposition from "various ecclesiastical bodies," which did not relish the proposed system of education, and which chose to consider the plan of Cornell University as nothing less than infidel and atheistic. He says, he tried "sweet reasonableness" with these opponents; he says he tried it fully. But it was all of no avail. Then he dropped sweet reasonableness, and he drew himself forth with all his other intellectual powers. He dropped all sorts of reasonableness, sweet and bitter alike. And he delivered a lecture instead. So he tells us, or, to be scrupulously precise, so at least we understand him. The lecture was listened to by his *côterie;* and the next day it was published by one of the *côterie* of Dr. Andrew White. This he certainly tells us; and there is no mistaking him here; for he says that Horace Greely, who published the lecture next day, in the New York *Tribune*, was "one of the Cornell University trustees." The lecture consisted apparently in sounding all the trumpets of war. He called his subject "The Battlefields of Science;" and he has not left us in darkness as to his exact thesis. The general tenor is quite unmistakable, as much so as a bugle-blast. It runs thus: "In all modern history, interference with science in the supposed interest of religion, no matter how conscientious such interference may have been, has resulted in the direst evils both to religion and to science, and invariably; and, on the other hand, all untrammelled scientific investigation, no matter how dangerous to religion some of its stages may have seemed for the time to be, has invariably resulted in the highest good both of religion and of science."[1]

Considering that this thesis was to be treated in the teeth of "sweet reasonableness," there could be no mistake about its tenor. Perhaps the same consideration will acount for

1 Introd. p. viii.

the absence of definition in the terms. What, for instance, is Science? What is Religion? Did the little lecture explain what it was talking about? If it did, how comes it that the big work, which is only the embryonic lecture grown up, contains no definition? Has the big thing consumed the little one, as giant cells absorb small ones in the organic current of life? The Doctor's intellectual development presents as many mysteries as evolutionary biology.

The lecture, he tells us, grew into a series of addresses; then into magazine articles; finally, into a small book on the "Warfare of Science." Just then, rather unseasonably, Prof. John W. Draper interposed, and published a larger work on the "Conflict of Science and Religion." So Dr. White had to trim his sails, or his title; or his occupation would be gone. He doomed his title. And, when the tiny book and the blushing articles waxed into a lusty, burly series for the *Popular Science Monthly*, they assumed the insinuating grace of being "*New* Chapters in the Warfare of Science." Now, really, there was nothing new in them, not even the demonstration about St. Francis Xavier. Yet the series had still to come sailing out on the sea of classic literature. Hence out it comes; it drops overboard the fanciful claim of being new; it steers clear of Professor Draper's term "religion;" and now it is "The Warfare of Science with Theology."

Here we cannot forbear entering a gentle protest and complaint. With all due respect for them, we must say that it is our separated brethren, or rather the preachers of our separated brethren, who are responsible for all this. They would not have Dr. White's "sweet reasonableness;" they have driven him to where he is to-day; and they have brought him down on the Catholic Church of Rome. They will not take it amiss if we venture to assume that theology and religion are chiefly identified by the whole civilized world with the Roman Catholic Church. Why then did the preachers of our separated brethren ever drive Dr. White into his present state of mind?

§ 3.

We have seen then, according to his own account, what was the governing influence which reduced the distinguished author to his present condition. There were at the same time a few subjective conditions preëxisting in the gentleman's bosom, which made the operating influence combine with them, and issue in a diagonal direction, as in a parallelogram of forces. Though not a Christian, he had a creed of his own; he belonged to a sect. Conformably with Dr. Milner's very exact prognostication of such a performance as this, we had found a place for the performer in the sect of "deists and infidels." We are not quite sure whether he has accepted of the classification. There is something about the notes, in which he pays his compliments to us, that starts a doubt in our mind. Then there is something about his production in general, which would originate the suspicion that he considers himself as standing in some relation to science, even perhaps as being a scientist. However that be, there is at least one thing certain: it is that he believes in Evolution. He swears by its beard. Though we should wish that the object of his worship were something defined and intelligible, still, on the whole, we may believe him when he swears. Thus at last we are enabled to arrive at a definition, in genus and species, of the gentleman who has put these two large volumes together. He belongs to the species of Amateur Evolutionists; and his genus has already been given by the able Bishop Milner. Thus, if he will never give us a definition, we have loyally begun with one. We should have felt as lonely without one as we did feel in the desolate pages of Dr. White.

But all this does not solve the other difficulty, to see what it is he means, what it is he has undertaken to do in his book. In the name of scientific and common intelligence, what is he driving at? Is it nothing more than the licentious blasphemy at all things religious and sacred, the prurient lasciviousness, the blank atheism of the French and German originals, whom he has been helplessly, hopelessly,

and, we should be glad to believe, innocently copying? To them and to a few others he merely adds some wonderful stories of his own.

The "theology" he berates includes every form of religion and of religious sentiment, from paganism pure and simple, from Buddhism, Mahomedanism, through all forms of heresies and denominations, on to what he so often and so gracefully designates as the "fetichism" or "fetiches" of the Catholic Church of Rome. All the Christianity founded on the Holy Bible he sketches on his last page under the colors which he has laid on through 800 previous pages; it is all a mass of "hatred, malice and all uncharitableness; of fetichism, subtlety and pomp; of tyranny, bloodshed and solemnly constituted imposture."[1] The "science," which he has canonized in the same mass of pages, is something which has shed a "divine light," and brought it into the mind and heart and soul of man—a revelation, not of the Fall of Man, but of the "Ascent of Man[2]." The distribution of power between these two forces is made throughout as follows. Everything foolish that anybody ever did or thought, if at that time he was a believer in anything religious, or might be imagined to be undergoing influences of belief in the air about him, all this goes under the head of "theology." If it was absurd, if it was less enlightened, if it fell short of an intelligence pure and undefiled, such for instance as the author's, then it was theology that did it. If it was anything that reached not quite to the level of some "power in the universe, outside of ourselves,"[3] but not outside of the author, then it all belonged to theology—no, not quite; it belonged to "dogmatic theology." In this way, even notorious people of his own creed, and even Voltaire himself, erred stupidly enough sometimes, because they were under some temporary access of theology. The only class which seems to come out comparatively clear from the great *débâcle* is that of the modern Voltairean evolutionists. And the only individual who really escapes from all, intact

1 Vol. ii., p. 395. 2 Ibid. 3 Introd. p. xii.

and unscathed, is the serene and imperturbable writer, whose intelligence looks forth on the spectacle around him, with "speculation in his eyes." On the other hand, it is still possible that any other person may escape for a brief moment from the grand rout and ruin of human intelligence. Christians themselves have actually done some good things. The cyclopedias, which the author has used, have reported the facts to him. "The press dispatches in the newspapers," which he so judiciously quotes, have not buried all the feats of Christians in silence. Monks, too, Priests and Jesuits, whom the Doctor masticates with such particular relish, have all contributed some good deeds or words. Then that was owing to "science," a breath of science passing over them for the nonce, the fresh air of sweet evolution cooling their fervid brow—just for a too brief instant. For the rest, all that has ever been done in the world, making for enlightenment, and "making for righteousness," all this is the work of Dr. A. D. White's "science."

Such a presentation of "history," as the author pompously calls his book, is entirely a product of our latter-day saints. It is not the form of history with scientists of an earlier date, nor, indeed, with any real scientists to-day. Development, evolution, progress, are not altogether new ideas. Their history has been written before this. But those who wrote about them do not seem to have considered it necessary for their thesis, or rather for their history, that all humanity which went before should be vilified. These latter years the American government has taken great pains to illustrate the evolution of mechanical arts. Electricity is there, the locomotive and other things are there. It was inevitable that more imperfect appliances of an earlier date should be sketched and illustrated, to show the march of improvements. One might have seen the original locomotive and cars at the Centennial or the Columbian Exposition. No one certainly would be anxious to make a journey now with the help of such contrivances. Yet we are not aware that either spectators or writers or even the great men of the government thought such original efforts worthy only of ridicule. Our

perfect work would never have come into existence, but for the genius which devised the tentative originals. And heretofore it was thought to be only street-gamins who could afford to laugh at manners and ways which were strange to them; or to throw stones at houses which happened not to lie in their own alley.

Take a literary instance in the author's own line of activity, though a world away from the author's style. There is Whewell's "History of the Inductive Sciences," wherein with the eye, the competency, the critical faculty of a master, of a judge and a historian, that eminent writer leads one through all the preceding stages of applied science, and traces the progress from the imperfect to the perfect, from difficult efforts to complete inductive results. The ages pass before us in his pages; monks and the clergy combine with others in the great onward movement; and the generations that come are heirs to all that the generations gone before have garnered for posterity. The room for gratified criticism in contemplating the past is a pleasure for two reasons, first, as implying how much was really done, albeit not more just then, and, secondly, how through the progress made in times past we have been enabled to advance much farther. And Macaulay has observed that the little girl, who has read the Dialogues of Mrs. Marcel on Political Economy, could give lessons on finance to Montague or to Walpole; and that any intelligent man now-a-days can, after a little perseverance, learn more of mathematics in a few years, than the great Newton knew after fifty years of meditation and study.

Now the singular thing in all this evolution of the past, and in the history thereof, is that neither the persons who took an active part in such development ever thought it necessary to despise their predecessors, nor have others, who looked on and told the story, thought it incumbent on them to find objects of ridicule, laughing-stocks, scare-crows; still less to search out some ever-present and universal cause, why the glorious times of steam and electricity did not come sooner, why sanitation as the essence of all holiness, and the discovery that insanity or hypnotism were the cause of all

immorality and wickedness, did not gratify the intelligence of the world long ago. Or, if they did search out and find that Christianity traced holiness and wickedness to some other cause than hygiene and delusion, they never thought it necessary to ridicule Christianity for that.

Dr. A. D. White, late professor of history at Cornell University, has thought otherwise. He has thought that the history of the evolution he swears by must consist in a general indictment of all the religious sentiment which has ever existed in the world. He was not indeed far astray, when he felt that the history of evolution must consist in attacking something else; for a scientific history of its own will only then be possible, when it has something scientifically proved. Hence, not having aught at present, the vagabond theory has nothing to do, in the way of history, except what every other vagabond does with property not his own. He does not seem to be quite aware of this, for "Darwinism" appears to be his god; so that a scientific amateur, somewhere from the region of Cornell University, is ignorant of the fact that the evolution of the evolutionists is only the disintegration of extinct Darwinism into a multitude of contradictory bits and pieces, now struggling for the survival of the fittest. This is a patent fact in all the literature of science. "Natural Selection" is gone long ago. There was Dr. Romanes—even Dr. Romanes himself—who had foresworn the faith of his father (we believe he was a clergyman's son), to live and die by Mr. Darwin—well he did die the other day, a good while after Darwin, but not before he had recanted, and declared, with the conscious responsibility of speaking before the shade of his master: "Natural Selection has been made to pose as a theory of the Origin of Species, whereas in point of fact it is nothing of the kind."[1] This was his thesis, which he proved at length; and he substituted for it a Physiological Selection of his own. This is all a good while ago; and other things much worse have been going on elsewhere. And lo! we have an

1 *Nature*, London, Aug. 5, 1886, p. 315.

amateur evolutionist of Cornell University, in the year 1896, still talking of Darwinism, as if he were living in a far-off dark age of twenty-five years ago, when Darwinism was still believed to be true! Well, it may suit him after all. He is strong on fetiches and fetichism. And now that Darwinism has gone into the mummified state, it will suit Dr. A. D. White. His act of faith is formulated in the first volume;[1] and his two volumes are its amplification.

They are drawn generally from second-hand sources. Not that he has not seen original books of consequence. But we shall note particularly what is meant by his "seeing" original works. The manner of seeing will be found to be quite as original as any work could be. In the meantime, we note that in amplifying the formula of his creed he does not resemble Gibbons, who tried to "sap a solemn creed with solemn sneer." His depth is not deep enough, even in his notes, to yield the fundamental tone of solemnity; and the trilling of his text does not pretend to do so. The predominant key of a Gibbons' sneer requires the capacities of a Gibbons' style. The sound which is emitted by an effort like "The Warfare of Science with Theology" is rather that of a snarl, and one very "long-drawn out." For that peculiar sound, which we are all well acquainted with, is known to be monotonous; so are these chapters. As it requires no critical sense to emit it, so it requires no critical ear to catch it. And, as it can go on well nigh unconsciously even in a doze, coming as it does from a limited range of organs, so these chapters, issuing from a very moderate degree of abilities, run on and on, even when both author and reader are somnolent. In fine, as in the one case there may be an absolute disconnection without prejudice to the music, so the composition here is desultory. It is so for two reasons. He has stitched pieces in his new work to parts of the old chapters—those which were called "New Chapters in the Warfare of Science"; sometimes, he has not even stitched them together; he has merely pinned them together and left

1 Page 66, seq.

them so. Besides, his profoundly careful manner of composition has led to the same desultory result. He tells us that he has been writing his famous chapters "sometimes on an Atlantic steamer, sometimes on a Nile boat, and not only in my own library at Cornell, but in those of Berlin, Helsingfors, Munich, Florence and the British Museum."[1]

§4.

Let us illustrate the monotonous character to which the fanaticism of a single idea can drive a man:

"Chapter 1. From Creation to Evolution. Ancient and modern views. . . . Rise of the Conception of Evolution. . . . Its survival through the Middle Ages, despite the disfavor of the Church. . . . Breaking down of the theological idea of Evolution. . . . Contributions to the theory of Evolution. . . . Attacks on Darwin and his theories. Attacks on Darwin's "Descent of Man." Attempts at compromise. Last outbursts of theological hostility. Final victory of Evolution."—This is the form in which all the twenty chapters are cast, with the same fanfaronade throughout.

"Ch. 4. From Signs and Wonders to Law in the Heavens. Theological efforts to crush the scientific view. Theological efforts at compromise. The final victory of science."

"Ch. 5. From Genesis to Geology. Efforts to suppress the scientific view. Surrender of the theologians. Remnants of the old belief. Final efforts at compromise. The victory of science complete."

"Ch. 11. From "the prince of the power of the air" to meteorology. Development of a scientific view of the heavens. Final efforts to revive the old belief. Franklin's lightning-rod."

"Ch. 12. From Magic to Chemistry and Physics. Theological theory of gases. Growth of a scientific theory. Triumph of the scientific theory. The triumph of chemistry and physics. Modern opposition to science in Catholic countries."

1 Introd., p. x.

"Ch. 13. From Miracles to Medicine. Growth of legends of healing. The life of Xavier as a typical example. Final breaking-down of the theological theory in medicine."

"Ch. 14. From Fetich to Hygiene. Theological apotheosis of filth. Gradual decay of theological views regarding sanitation. The triumph of sanitary science."

"Ch. 15. From Demoniacal Possession to Insanity. Theological ideas of lunacy and its treatment. The beginnings of a healthful skepticism. The final struggle and victory of science."

And so forth, and so forth.

Now, if any one can perform the feat, let him image forth to himself the degree of fanaticism, which could devise twenty chapters, each a treatise in length, on the same inexorable plan. The analysis of each contains some fifty such headings for every eighty pages. Imagine the romanticism of an attempt, without the style of a romance to do poetic justice to something called "science," by such irredeemable insipidity. There had been reason, if such a mind consulted reason, to omit carefully all explanation of what the "science" was, and what the "theology" was, which were thus to be shown, as on a mountebank's car, at dagger's-ends with one another from the beginning of creation even till now. There was method in this part of the derangement. But, unless it was to be supposed that every reader in the United States was equally deranged, or that at least a sufficiently large number of them were so, there is no comprehending how such a mass of materials was ever put forth in solemn-looking volumes, compiled as they are from the refuse of rationalism in other countries, from cyclopedia literature, from old grandpa's tales, and even daily newspapers, and savoring strongly of a certain suggestiveness, both moral and material, for which the writer seems to have a special predilection. He uses the word himself, "filthiness;" and it occurs repeatedly in his pages. As over the witches' caldron, so here black spirits and white, blue spirits and gray, have contributed their choicest bits from bog and fen and moor to

the author's somber entertainment. If we might venture to be romantic ourselves, we might shadow him forth as resembling that poetic fiend, who

> "O'er bog, or steep, through strait, rough, dense or rare,
> With head, hands, wings or feet, pursues his way,
> And swims or sinks, or wades or creeps, or flies."

We shall see in our next, how he wades or sinks or flies through his legend about St. Francis Xavier.

# II.

## The Cornell Historian: or,

### Dr. A. D. White's Legend about St. Francis Xavier.

---

WE said a few words in the last number of this REVIEW, about the Voltairian enterprise of Dr. A. D. White in undertaking to reform history. We called attention to the masterpiece in his production, which was that of reducing St. Francis Xavier's glories to a more modest level. "I am tired of hearing him always called the Just," said the Athenian citizen, who was voting for the ostracism of Aristides; and so the free-minded citizen voted him off. We imagine it must be painful for the denomination which rejoices in Voltaire as a saint of its calendar, to hear these Catholic saints talked about and extolled, as, for prudential reasons, never a saint of its own might be descanted on. We do not know Voltaire as Mr. White does. We speak only at second-hand about him, just as Dr. White does about many things. We borrow our ideas of the saint and his clients from M. Nourrison for instance, in his work on Voltaire and Voltairianism. On the other hand, the Doctor does not know St. Francis Xavier. He borrows his chief ideas about our Saint from some lore not yet catalogued; and these fundamental notions are different from ours. We will signalize the difference here just under one aspect. He likens St. Francis Xavier to "fervent Protestant missionaries." We have nothing to say about Protestant missionaries; but we will say, we should never think of likening a Voltairian saint to any one among our own, nor even, thanks be to God, to one of ourselves. We would recommend the Doctor to be more jealous, in our regard, of the "idols of his tribe," and the "idols of his den," as Bacon so judiciously

terms them. And, when he makes his devout reading privately, he may keep his information strictly private, to be had in the new book of M. Nourrisson, Membre de l'Institut: *Voltaire et le Voltairianisme.*

§I.

We remarked before that we made a number of discoveries, on reading the Doctor's new book edition of his previous pleasant essay. We discovered that he had carefully left out some things and had inserted quite a number of others. In strict accord with the tenor of our criticism he has changed his text, which he had a perfect right to manipulate; but he has also manipulated other people's texts, which he had no right to do. In changing his own text, he has done it quite privately—*sub rosa*, as it were—but then, under cover of his changed text, he has turned to make an onslaught upon us, as if he had never run to cover. We are glad he profited so far by our corrections; but we do not altogether like the manner of this higher criticism, or rather this uuderhand criticism—we do not quite like it. Amid the authors whom he had libelled in his first essay, we discover but little change for the better; they still stand disgraced in his pages, with his libels pinned fast to them; and a number of new ones have been captured to bear them company in misfortune.

For all this kind of literary and historical business, he has a gentle phrase of his own; which however suits us perfectly. He calls it all "errors of omission and commission," and he begs a full and free indulgence beforehand; and he hopes to be allowed to keep his literary respectability with his publishers and the public. To secure him on this flank, Dr. Adams sent out the flying column of his pages in *The Forum*, with much commendation, particularly on the subject of St. Francis Xavier. This seems to be the only peccadillo that any body had undertaken seriously to criticize.

The respectability demanded in their authors by what are considered first-class publishing houses is of a very elastic kind. Still, those houses have a sincere and rooted objection

to putting forth articles and books which afterwards are found to be absurd and ridiculous, and which will take rank with old wives' stories and old men's dreams. The Macmillans of London were not likely to have known of this gentleman's previous escapade in New York, to the prejudice of the Appletons. Honoring then the Macmillans of London with his manuscript, and the public of the British Empire as well as of the American Republic with his book, he reassures all alike with a paragraph in his Introduction; and he indicates the perfectly reliable character of his work. The paragraph runs thus:

"That errors of omission and commission will be found here and there is probable—nay certain; but the substance of the book will, I believe, be found perfectly true. I am encouraged in this belief by the fact that of the three bitter attacks which this work in its earlier form encountered, one was purely declamatory, objurgatory and hortatory, and the others based on ignorance of facts easily pointed out."[1]

We have not observed anywhere in his two volumes an answer to the other attacks, whatever they were. The only one, which we see that he repels, is that for which we are responsible. But we fail to recognize ourselves in the description here given of "the three bitter attacks." The criticism which we passed was not purely "declamatory, objurgatory and hortatory," since the Doctor has been so much put out of his way, in text and notes, and also put out of humor, in the attempt to answer us. Neither could it be among those "based on ignorance of facts easily pointed out;" for it is the Doctor who has recast his facts, dropped assertions, changed quotations, altered his text, and sailed a new course to save some canvas in the breeze. We do not recognize ourselves in this introductory description. But we do find ourselves in his book, in notes and in text; and that with a vengeance both active and passive.

Let us give Dr. White's Xaverian legend in its sternest simplicity. He is about to start his thirteenth round, on

1 Introd. p. x.

the same track as all the twelve before, but of course with a different name. The sign he puts up this time is "From Miracles to Medicine."[1] He starts upon the assumption that "there were evolved theories of miraculous methods of cure, based upon modes of appeasing the Divine anger, or of thwarting Satanic malice;" and that, through a refracting medium of theories like these, the life and acts of Our Lord Jesus Christ was transmitted to subsequent generations. Both Old and New Testaments were responsible for such legendary theories. Under the influence of the theory, and of the acts of Our Lord as refracted through the theory, "legends of miracles grew luxuriously;" and they "have thus grown about the lives of all great benefactors of humanity in early ages, and about saints and devotees." "Modern thought holds the testimony to the vast mass of such legends in all ages as worthless." Still, "it is very widely acknowledged that great and gifted beings, who endow the earth with higher religious ideals, gaining the deepest hold upon the hearts and minds of multitudes, may at times exercise such influence upon those about them, that the sick in mind or body are helped or healed."[2] So far, all that the Doctor says is identical with the French and German rationalism of Strauss, Renan and their school. As to Our Lord, they will talk nicely about Him and blaspheme all the while. They acknowledge His place and influence in the world to the extent of attributing all the effects of His divine mission to some contagious power of example; for he was a "great benefactor," "a great and gifted being." The supernatural powers and endowments of the Saints are a legendary effort to enhance in favorite heroes the effects of Christian contagious example, which itself, as it is exhibited in the Bible, was previously enhanced and illuminated by the rays of a "refracting" theory.

"We have within the modern period," says the Doctor, "very many examples which enable us to study the evolu-

1 *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology*, by A. D. White; vol. ii., ch. 13, pp. 1–23.

2 Ibid. pp. 1–5.

tion of legendary miracles. Out of these I will select but one, which is chosen because it is the life of one of the most noble and devoted men in the history of humanity, one whose biography is before the world with its most minute details—in his own letters, in the letters of his associates, in contemporary histories, and in a multitude of biographies: this man is St. Francis Xavier. From these sources I draw the facts now to be given, but none of them are of Protestant origin; every source from which I shall draw is Catholic and Roman, and published under the sanction of the Church."[1] After some words on the Saint's remarkable career, the Doctor lays down the basis of his argument: that, "during his career as a missionary he (Xavier) wrote great numbers of letters, which were preserved and have since been published; and these, with the letters of his contemporaries, exhibit clearly all the features of his life;" nevertheless, "no account of a miracle wrought by him appears either in his own letters or in any contemporary document." We need not pause to direct the reader's attention to this basis of the Doctor's argumentation; for he himself does so to our perfect satisfaction. He repeats it over and over again, that the letters of the Saint and those of the Saint's contemporaries "exhibit clearly all the features of his life"—"his life, as exhibited so fully by himself and his contemporaries." He inculcates it: "so far as Xavier's own writings are concerned." He returns to it: "though he (Xavier) writes of his doings with especial detail." And, after all the affirmations, which are kept rigidly bound in the straight-jacket of these restrictive clauses, the Doctor is not yet content, but must needs refer to all of them as a demonstration made and concluded: "As we have seen (*sic*), he is very prompt to report anything which may be considered an answer to prayer."[2] "Nor do the letters of his associates show knowledge of any miracles wrought by him." The Doctor proves this from the collection made by Emanuel Acosta; and then adds in general: "The same is true of various other similar collections published during the sixteenth and seventeenth

1 Ibid. p. 5.

2 Ibid. pp. 6–7.

centuries. In not one of them does any mention of a miracle by Xavier appear in a letter from India or the East contemporary with him." Has the reader caught the idea? He must; and the Doctor comes back to it again: "To Xavier no miracles are imputed by his associates during his life or during several years after his death." Xavier himself and his associates confirm all this: "we find his own statements as to his personal limitations, and the difficulties arising from them, fully confirmed by his fellow-workers;" and notably in the famous case of the supposed gift of tongues.[1] —Dr. White is evidently a widely-read man, and emphatic.

So things went on "until about ten years after Xavier's death." But, "abundant legends had already begun to grow elsewhere." That makes little difference; for the Doctor turns round to reiterate the same peremptory statement for the eleventh time within three pages, that "not one word regarding these miracles came as yet from the country which, according to later accounts accepted and sanctioned by the Church, was at this very period filled with miracles; not the slightest indication of them from the men who were supposed to be in the very thick of these miraculous manifestations." —We are repeating this repetition, which is a little nauseous, if not suspicious; because the Doctor wants it to be impressed deeply on the mind; and so do we.

He continues: "But this negative evidence is by no means all. There is also positive evidence—direct testimony from the Jesuit order itself—that Xavier wrought no miracles." Then he follows with an entirely new demonstration, which he has discovered—though he does not say so—since he wrote in *The Popular Science Monthly*. It is the only piece of "positive evidence" in the entire legend; and we are not quite sure whether it is not the finest piece of demonstration in the two volumes.[2] If we have time and space, we shall see more of it. For the present, we state that it is from Joseph Acosta, who, says Dr. White, affirms that St. Francis Xavier never wrought a miracle. Then comes a long note,

1 Ibid. pp. 7–8.

2 Ibid. pp. 9–10.

about the subject we have offered to the Doctor's consideration, that is, the miraculous preservation of the Saint's body at the present day. He disposes of that.

Now, some nineteen years having passed since the Saint's death, and no miracles having yet been heard of, nay all miracles having been positively denied, the evolution of the legend is in order. Says the Doctor: "Nothing shows better than the sequel how completely the evolution of miraculous accounts depends upon the intellectual atmosphere of any land and time, and how independent it is of fact."[1]

After this, of course, we cannot pretend to have a single word to say. If the basis of the argument is so complete, we shall have to concede all the rest. For it is notorious that the literature about St. Francis is replete with the miraculous. And, if nothing was ever heard of such a thing, during about twenty years after the Saint's death, then we may as well concede to the Doctor whatever he wants.

So he continues at once, beginning now the evolution of the legend: "Shortly after Xavier's heroic and beautiful death in 1552, stories of miracles wrought by him began to appear." Then he begins with series of miracles, dating from two years, three years, and four years, after Xavier's death. But how is this? He had just said that nothing was heard of miracles during some twenty years; now he begins to recount the miracles on record only two years after the death of Xavier! To common minds this seems a little odd. Really, it looks stranger than it is. The piece about Joseph Acosta is new; so too is all that he has said about Emanuel Acosta and the collections; he has devised these parts since he wrote before; and he has pinned them in between two paragraphs, as they stood in the original article. Thus with naive simplicity, he proceeds to rehearse in an old paragraph, how first one Provincial in India, and then another Provincial away in the wilds of Ethiopia, and then the King of Portugal and the Viceroy of India, were either reporting miracles and prodigies, or were actively engaged

1 Ibid. pp. 11–12.

in instituting juridical processes about the miracles of St. Francis Xavier; and this within four years after his death. Here he seems to feel something of the jar upon his reader's nerves, at this singular combination of logic. And he sews in a new piece, beginning with the eternal affirmation, which we have already heard eleven times, that "the letters of the missionaries who had been co-workers or immediate successors of Xavier in his Eastern field were still silent as regards any miracles by him, and they remained silent for nearly ten years."[1] Let us hasten to assure the Doctor that we understand him perfectly; for fear he should repeat it again.

Now appear "the first faint beginnings of these legends," even in the letters of the Indian missionaries. And he quotes Almeida. But the Doctor turns to the Council of Trent, and finds that they must have thought very little there of the legendary lore which was beginning to grow. For Julius Gabriel Eugubinus delivered a solemn oration before the assembled Fathers; and he said nothing about Xavier's miracles. And then there were letters written to and fro all this time; and the Doctor finds not a word about Xavier's miracles. And a Jesuit wrote a letter, "twenty years after Xavier's death;" and Julius Gabriel Eugubinus translates the said letter into Latin; and there is not an allusion to Xavier's miracles.

Meanwhile, "the more zealous and less critical brethren in Europe" were nourishing and watering "the vast mass of legends, always luxuriant and sometimes beautiful," which had begun to grow.—We are quoting the Doctor's imagery; he is quite imaginative, and sometimes poetic, especially when he is at logic.—All the literature henceforth merely "grew." According to Dr. White's idea and assumption, every writer had only a predecessor in the same trade to copy and improve upon—which is certainly his own practice. The series which he gives includes Maffei, 1588; Tursellini, 1594; the canonization proceedings, for which he puts down the date 1622; Fr. Bouhours, 1682. St.

1 Ibid. p. 12.

Francis Xavier had died in 1552; thus Bouhours comes one hundred and thirty years later; and the Doctor makes fine capital of that popular writer; for it is understood that there is no logic called for any more. The evolution of legend consists here in a mere comparison of writer with writer, the original basis having been well secured that there was no foundation in fact, and the subsidiary assumption being taken for granted that no writer had anything but some earlier writer to improve upon. Then Fr. Joseph Acosta comes up again—that *enfant terrible*—who, not satisfied with having "expressly told us that Xavier wrought no miracles,"[1] makes an "explicit declaration" that he had not the gift of tongues.[2]

We had indeed fondly imagined that our textual quotations from Maffei and Tursellini, on a former occasion, would have won exemption for these two writers from any more of the Doctor's libelling. And we had made other citations too. But the interesting gentleman, when he does not like quotations, leaves them alone and substitutes his own more valuable affirmations; and, when he does like them, he brings them forward in such a guise that the authors would certainly have preferred to be left alone than to be parodied in defiance of grammar, parsing and sense.

One little element more: it is those juridical proceedings necessary for canonization. He does not touch that matter in immediate connection with the Saint, but, some pages further on gratifies us with this note: "For some very thoughtful remarks as to the worthlessness of the testimony to miracles presented during the canonization proceedings at Rome, see Maury, *Légendes Pieuses*."[3] It was thus the note stood in his former essay; and, let us confess it candidly, we showed some bad humor then, on seeing a grave question handled in this style; but then we gave a very full explanation of what is meant by canonization proceedings. Omitting all notice of this, the Doctor punishes us now for our bad temper, by adding to the former note this significant

1 P. 9. 2 P. 21. 3 P. 25, note.

reference, "pp. 4–7." Well, we deserved all this; and now we have Maury on our hands, pages 4 to 7,—three whole pages.

The great demonstration regarding St. Francis Xavier's miracles has become twice as long in the book, text and notes included, as it had been in the Monthly. In both editions he concludes with words which show the extensive bearing of his demonstration on all miracles in the Church: "These examples (of Xavier's biographers) will serve to illustrate the process which in thousands of cases has gone on from the earliest days of the Church until a very recent period. Everywhere miraculous cures became the rule rather than the exception throughout Christendom."[1]

§2.

From all that we have reported it is clear, that there is nothing in the pages of Dr. White which is not deliberate and calculated. There is no question now of inadvertence. He has studied the question again, and has published just what he wanted to say. He has issued it, with his friend, Dr. Adams, supporting him, and selecting precisely this piece about St. Francis Xavier as the specimen by which all may be judged.

In taking up the gage, we feel that, though we shall reëstablish the case of the miracles as they stand in history and not in Dr. White's legend, still that is not the most important work before us. We imagine that what concerns the public more is to see in Dr. White an example—an example of the sect and the tribe, to the idols of which, in Baconian phrase, he has dedicated his work.

In the specimen legend which he has given us, we count up roughly two false assumptions, three false assertions, four gratuitous affirmations; four times he does not seem to know what he is driving at, or else he is deliberately evading the point; there is a protracted vein of self-contradic-

1 Pp. 22–23.

tion, besides a paralogism; and as to false quotations, with the text ostentatiously open before him, we have not counted them up. We may possibly excuse the Doctor here; for he does not seem to know Latin. But does he not understand French? It is hard to believe that an ex-minister to Russia and an ex-minister to Germany, and now returned to his former post as Ambassador to Germany, does not understand French.

We begin with the strongest proof in the whole performance. It is the one positive proof; and he has discovered it since he wrote before. It was indeed a little awkward that, with all his other apparatus, negative, inferential, conjectural, he should not have been able to adduce a single positive testimony from a competent person to the effect that St. Francis Xavier had never worked a miracle at all. We had taunted him with this, saying that "the intrinsic plausibility of a legendary evolution seemed to be demonstration enough," and that, "its scientific prestige, we might suppose, lent to the light flippancy which made up the body of his article an air of circumstantial evidence that invited no further inquiry." That gap he has now been enabled to fill up with Joseph Acosta.

He says that "the highest contemporary authority on the whole subject, a man in the closest correspondence with those who knew most about the Saint, a member of the Society of Jesus in the highest standing and one of its accepted historians, not only expressly tells us that Xavier wrought no miracles, but gives the reason why he wrought none. This man was Joseph Acosta, a provincial of the Jesuit order, its visitor in Aragon, superior at Valladolid, and finally rector of the University of Salamanca."[1] The Doctor, who seems to be taking this from Sommervogel's *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jesus*, omits the fact that Joseph Acosta filled none of these offices before he left Europe for Peru and the West Indies, whither he went in 1571 and where he wrote his book. Our author continues:

1 P. 9.

"In 1571, nineteen years after Xavier's death, Acosta devoted himself to write a work mainly concerning the conversion of the Indies." This would be the year in which he went to Peru. We do not know where the Doctor got this date for the composition of the book. In any case, it was written in the West Indies, as Joseph Acosta tells King Philip II. The Doctor might have told us, though, that the Indies in question are, not the East, but the West Indies, that is, the islands, and Peru and Mexico. He goes on: "and in this (work of Acosta's) he refers especially and with the greatest reverence to Xavier, holding him up as an ideal and his work as an example." That is correct; Xavier in the East Indies was a very good example for his far-off brethren, 12,000 miles away, where Fr. Joseph Acosta was provincial. "But on the same page," says the Doctor, "with this tribute to the great missionary, Acosta goes on to discuss the reasons why progress in the world's conversion is not so rapid as in the early apostolic times, and says that one especial cause why apostolic preaching could no longer produce apostolic results 'lies in the missionaries themselves, because there is now no power of working miracles.' He then asks, 'Why should our age be so completely destitute of them?' This question he answers at great length, and one of his main contentions is that in early apostolic times illiterate men had to convert the learned of the world, whereas in modern times the case is reversed, learned men being sent to convert the illiterate; and hence that 'in the early times miracles were necessary, but in our time they are not.' This argument and statement refer, as we have seen, directly to Xavier by name, and to the period covered by his activity and that of the other great missionaries of his time. That the Jesuit order and the Church at large thought this work of Acosta trustworthy is proved by the fact that it was published at Salamanca a few years after it was written, and republished afterwards with ecclesiastical sanction in France."[1] So far the Doctor, who then gives us in a note the exact Latin title

1 Ibid pp. 9–10.

of Acosta's work, and the locality of his quotation. The reference to his Salamanca edition of 1589, which may have been the first, agrees with our Cologne edition of seven years later.[1] There is little difference even in the numbering of the pages. He tells us that his copy is in the Cornell University Library. We are very glad of that, for we should like persons to consult it, in the light of the remarks we are about to make.[2]

This champion demonstration, on which Dr. Adams as a learned reviewer and a personal friend of Dr. White's was authorized to stake the author's name, learning, sagacity and reputation, presents a respectable appearance, and we feel pleased at making its acquaintance. But could our readers divine whence it was that the Doctor, since his first edition, derived his information about Joseph Acosta, and then discovered the book and the peremptory argument? From no one else but ourselves! We cited the argument for him, as a hundred years old; we cited it from Dr. Milner, who rebutted it when Dr. Douglas the Protestant Bishop of Salisbury advanced it, and who quoted Acosta's exact testimony against Douglas and the whole line of men following Douglas. All this we gave in a full, long extract from Milner,[3] too long to repeat here. Milner quoted the copy in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. Dr. White has secured a copy now for himself; he has studied the context in question; and he has also, to judge by his notes, studied other contexts. He is so well pleased with the thesis of the Bishop of Salisbury, that he has adopted it. It stood thus in Dr. Douglas' pages: He would bring "conclusive evidence," he said, "that, during thirty-five years from the death of Xavier, his miracles had not been heard of. The evidence I shall allege is that of Acosta, who himself had been a missionary among the Indians. His work, *De Procuranda Indorum Salute*, was printed in 1589—that is, above thirty-seven years after the

1 *Coloniae Agrippinæ*, 1596.

2 We have little doubt other copies are to be found in the Jesuit libraries of the United States.

3 *Cath. World*, Oct. 1891, pp. 20–22.

death of Xavier; and in it we find an express acknowledgment that *no miracles had ever been performed by missionaries among the Indians.* Acosta was himself a Jesuit, and therefore from his silence we may infer unexceptionably, that between thirty and forty years had elapsed before Xavier's miracles were thought of." This thesis, which we had quoted, pleased Dr. White so much, that he has adopted it and has improved it considerably by his own private researches in Acosta. He was not so well pleased with Dr. Milner's other passage from the same context; so he has left that out.

§3.

We regret having led the Doctor into this trap. But, since we did it, though unwittingly, we must now help him out of it. Because, both for what the Doctor says, and for what he omits, everything pertaining to his demonstration is false.

First, he omits this: "I doubt not," says Acosta, "that, if the former faith of our predecessors, if their piety and fervor of spirit returned, we should be witnesses again of the former works. Let us turn our eyes to the man of our age, the blessed Master Francis, a man of apostolic life, of whom so many great miracles (*signa*) are reported by very many (*per plurimos*) witnesses competent to testify, that, excepting the Apostles, more or greater ones are hardly to be found reported of any one else. Then, there is Master Gaspar,[1] and others of our members, not a few of them, in the East Indies,—what glory have they not given to the divine magnificence by the nations they have converted and the admirable works they have done! This has been seen too in the case of other men belonging to the sacred Orders; and it is not altogether a rarity in our West Indies likewise. Truly God gives grace to the humble."[2] In another context, after

1 Baertz.

2 J. Acosta, *De Procuranda Indorum Salute*, lib. ii., cap. x., p. 226 (Cologne edit.): Convertamus oculos in nostri saeculi hominem B. Magistrum Franciscum, virum Apostolicae vitae, cujus tot et tam magna signa referuntur per plurimos, eosque idoneos testes, ut vix de alio exceptis Apostolis plura aut majora legantur.

extolling divers religious orders whose missionaries were performing such wonders of zeal, he comes to "our own missionaries in the East Indies," and then adds: "Their leader, the holy Master Xavier would seem to have called back the splendor of the apostolic age, both by the brilliancy of his miracles, and by the magnitude of his feats, and by his endurance under labor." And again he refers to Master Gaspar on the hither side of the East Indies, to Cosmas Torres in Japan, to John Nobrega "in Brazil adjoining us," and to others.[1] And again, in another passage, dwelling on the importance and significance of miracles and supernatural gifts, he says: "Nothing strengthens more the hearts of the faithful preachers of Christ, than the witness of the Holy Ghost by means of His gifts and charismata, which He distributes as He will. And, indeed, it would take long to enumerate the gifts of the Spirit, the prodigies and miracles (*signa et miracula*), which, even in these times, when charity hath grown so cold, have illustrated the preaching of the faith, as well in those East Indies as in these West Indies. The affairs of Japan are well known."[2] All these things have been omitted by Dr. White, who has studied his Acosta so carefully.

Secondly, according to the Doctor, the Jesuit writer asks the question: "Why should our age be so completely destitute of miracles?" With all possible respect for so distinguished a personage, we must simply affirm that there is no such question in Joseph Acosta. It is not entirely a fabrication, because there is a foundation for it, in Latin badly translated. The Doctor gives us the Latin in his note: *Cur miracula in conversione gentium non fiant nunc, ut olim, a Christi praedicatoribus;* that is the title of Chapter ix., book ii.; and its

1 Ibid. lib. iv., cap. v., p. 368 (Cologne edit.): Quorum dux Sanctus Magister Xavier Apostolici temporis splendorem, et claritate signorum, et rerum magnitudine, et laborum tolerantia renovasse videri potest.

2 Ibid. lib. i. cap. vi., p. 141: Et quidem dona spiritus, signa et miracula, quae in Fidei praedicatione innotuerunt, his etiam temporibus, quando charitas usque adeo refrixit, enumerare longum esset, tum in Orientali illa India, tum in hac Occidentali. Res Japponensium notae jam sunt.

translation is: "Why are miracles not performed now as of old by the preachers of Christ, in the conversion of nations." And, beginning his chapter, he repeats: "Why is it that now-a-days, in the preaching of the Gospel to new nations, that power (or that quantity) of miracles is not seen, which Christ promised," *miraculorum illa vis non cernatur, quam Christus suis promisit.* How does the Doctor extract from this Latin his very original translation: "Why should our age be so completely destitute of miracles?"

Thirdly, far from understanding the text of the book, the ex-professor of history has not even caught the title of it. The book is not about the East Indies at all, but about the New World and the West Indies: *De Natura Novi Orbis, libri duo, et de Promulgatione Evangelii apud Barbaros, sive de Procuranda Indorum Salute, libri sex.* The title being too abstruse for the Doctor, it is not to be wondered at that he could not penetrate into the Dedicatory Epistle, in which Fr. Acosta tells his Catholic Majesty, who was king of the West, not of the East Indies, that by order of his superiors he had been sent to the New World, that he had traversed nearly the whole of *India Occidentalis*, that he spent fifteen years in Peru, two years in Mexico, and the Islands; and that now, on his return, he presents this little bouquet to his Majesty. He states, that he had written the books while still in those regions: *quos ego cum in illis adhuc regionibus agerem elabororam.*—Such is the book which the ex-professor of history implies was written by "a man in the closest correspondence with those who knew most about the Saint," "the highest contemporary authority on the whole subject," a provincial, a visitor, a superior, a rector. He was all this, chiefly after he had written the work. He was provincial probably before; but then he was provincial in Peru, some 12,000 miles away from Hindustan and Japan; and he wrote no work at any time on Japan or Hindustan, where St. Francis Xavier had lived and labored. Is this a good sample of the falsity of historical narration by means of the device called *innuendo*, or *suppressio veri*, suppressing the truth?

Fourthly, in keeping with his subject, Fr. Acosta never has occasion to speak of St. Francis Xavier directly. But, since the example of the great East Indian missionary was of such importance to the West Indian missionaries, he refers to the Saint from time to time; and we have seen in what terms.

Fifthly, our ex-professor of history says that Acosta "refers especially and with the greatest reverence to Xavier, holding him up as an ideal and his work as an example. But on the same page with this tribute to the great missionary, Acosta goes on to discuss the reasons" etc., and "then asks, "Why should our age be so completely destitute of miracles." It is painful to have to contradict a gentleman so often, even though it is an open book in his hands that will bear the odium of doing so. Two-thirds of this passage is false, as we have seen; and now we must add, the other third is false. Acosta does not mention St. Francis Xavier on the same page, nor for some pages previously; and then only when dispatching a question which forms an exact contrast with the subject he is treating now. He was speaking there of "the apostolical method and system" of preaching the Gospel to new nations, when they could go forth without any assistance or protection lent them by the civil power. Thus the Apostles did, enjoying the privilege, in this respect, of what has been called "the majesty of the Roman peace." Here he mentions St. Francis Xavier, as following the apostolical method of preaching the Gospel.[1] Then he goes on to institute a sharp contrast between that system and what missionaries are condemned to in the West Indies. Nothing could be more marked than the contrast: "Ours," he says, "have done splendidly (*praeclare*) over a great part of the East Indies, where in truly apostolical fashion they have been enabled (*licuit*) to announce Christ to so many nations, to Indians, Persians, Arabs, Ethiopians, Malabarites, Chinese and numberless others. But, among the greater part of the nations in this Western world, if one presumed

1 Ibid. lib. ii., cap. viii., p. 214.

to follow a method like that exactly, he would have to be declared utterly mad, and not without reason."[1] He thinks he discerns two reasons for the difference. One is the nature of the American Indians, whom he likens to "boars and crocodiles." The other is that, which Dr. White has quoted, "because there is no power of working miracles, such as the Apostles worked in abundance." Now the Doctor refers this to St. Francis Xavier, whom Acosta had left over in the contrary category. Continuing his theme, the Jesuit opens the wider question: "Why should there be the lack of miracles" in the New World?[2] But, then, in treating so general a question, he makes exceptions even for the American continent; and begins with prodigies wrought by three good shipwrecked soldiers in Florida, who lived among the Indians there for ten years; and, referring in the next place to the personal merit of missionaries, whose sanctity is crowned by the gifts of the Holy Ghost, he pays the magnificent tribute to St. Francis Xavier, which we have quoted before.[3]

Thus, then, everything in the grand and exemplary demonstration is false. The one positive proof which has been found out, contains not a single element in it that is true; as may be seen by referring to the "copy in Cornell University Library," or to any other copy. It is false that Acosta "tells us, Xavier wrought no miracles." It is false that Acosta "gives us the reasons why he wrought none." It is false that, "on the same page with his tribute to the great missionary," Acosta goes on to discuss why progress in the world's conversion is no longer so rapid as heretofore, and that this is because "there is now no power of working miracles." It is false that he asks the question: "Why should our age be so completely destitute of miracles?" It is false that the argument and the statement, attributed to Acosta, "refer, as we have seen directly to Xavier by name." Finally, it is false that "we have seen" any such thing, or any thing else that is attributed by Dr. Andrew White to

1 Ibid. same page. 2 Ibid. cap. ix. 3 Ibid. cap. x.

the Jesuit Joseph Acosta. Everything in the Doctor's demonstration is false in fact, quotation, implication and logic.

Now we are free to pass on and consider the Doctor's negative arguments. These happily will afford us more entertainment than the very grave disquisition on Father Joseph Acosta.

# III.

## Dr. White's Evolution:

### The Genesis and Structure of His Legend.

WE have observed before that the gentleman, whose creation in the literary and historical world we have been considering, and that with emotions of astonishment, if not of admiration, is in every sense of the term an evolutionist. He is so pronounced in this order of development, that, not only himself, but everything which comes near him, has to undergo the process of evolution, however remote it may have been before from enduring that painful operation. Miracles have been made an evolutionary product of imagination; and the great sample of modern times, presented in the life of St. Francis Xavier, has shared the common lot.

But here a strange phenomenon arrests our vision. It is that the gentleman himself, while treating this precise topic, does not evolve beyond his original texts. He has deteriorated considerably; not only in other parts and proofs since his former edition; but notably in the great positive proof, extracted by Dr. Douglas a century ago from the pages of Joseph Acosta. Dr. Douglas, the Protestant Bishop of Salisbury, the Rev. Le Mesurier, Hugh Farmer, Peter Roberts, down to the Rev. Mr. Greer, vicar of Templebodane and chaplain to Earl Talbot the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, had left the proof from Acosta in a much better condition than we found it to be in with Dr. White, before we paid our last compliments to the rudimentary creature.

With Dr. Douglas the fable stood thus: He would adduce "conclusive evidence that, during thirty-five years from the death of Xavier, his miracles had not been heard of. The evidence I shall allege," said he, "is that of Acosta, who

himself had been a missionary among the Indians. His work, *De Procuranda Indorum Salute* was printed in 1589—that is, above thirty-seven years after the death of Xavier; and in it we find an express acknowledgment that no miracles had ever been performed by missionaries among the Indians. Acosta was himself a Jesuit, and therefore from his silence we may infer, unexceptionably, that between thirty and forty years had elapsed before Xavier's miracles were thought of."[1]

At first blush it might appear that Dr. White does not deteriorate notably from his original. He too accepts of the Protestant theologian's logic so far as to consider "silence" an "express acknowledgment." Dr. White is even more forcible just here, and with reason. He thought that a general question about the rarity of miracles in modern times authorized him to apply the very expressive terms, "positive evidence—direct testimony" to the proof from Acosta. Here there is no deterioration, either in the affirmation which is rather an improvement, or in the logic, which is on a par. Nor again was there any deterioration in assuming that, if one man was silent about miracles, therefore no miracles had ever been wrought; nor finally in suppressing texts and falsifying Acosta generally. So far there is no degeneration in Dr. White; no devolution; none of what evolutionists call Catagenesis. He is equal to his ancestor of a hundred years ago.

But in other respects he degenerates marvelously. Dr. Douglas had said: "No miracle heard of during thirty-five years;" Dr. White drops down unconscionably to nineteen years, to four years, to two years, to no years at all. Dr. Douglas had it: "No miracle;" Dr. White has it: "Quite a number." If we had the ear of Professor Cope just for five minutes, we would urge on him strongly the propriety of substituting this live instance of catagenesis for his old fossils of the rudimentary teeth of the fœtal whale, and the legs with which the boa cannot run away, and the wings

1 Quoted by us in the *Catholic World*, Oct. 1891, p. 22.

with which the ostrich cannot fly. Here we have rudiments running down visibly before our eyes.

§ 1.

Says Dr. White: "Two or three things occurred" during Xavier's life; and he goes on: "For example." Then he gives three occurrences as examples. There are more than three, even in Dr. White's opinion; because these three are given only by way of "example." Since he wrote his first edition, he has found out even more. For then, when he came to the third, he put down "finally." There was no harm in that; it was the last example he meant to adduce; so without prejudice he might say "finally." But he thought prudence the better part of valor; and, to be quite safe from the side of any punctilious critic, he changed "finally" into a safer word: "Again." From this we infer that he had more "examples;" and still more facts.[1]

So he had. It appears that he finds Melchior Nuñez, Provincial of the Jesuits in the Portuguese dominions of Asia, reporting three, only two years after Xavier's death. It appears that De Quadros, Provincial of the Jesuits in the distant country of Ethiopia, "had heard of nine miracles, and asserted that Xavier had healed the sick and cast out devils;" this was in 1555, only three years after Xavier's death. It appears that "the next year, being four years after Xavier's death, King John III. of Portugal, a very devout man, directed his viceroy Barreto to draw up and transmit to him an authentic account of Xavier's miracles, urging him to do the work 'with zeal and speedily.'" Again, only ten years after Xavier's death, "the Jesuit Almeida, writing at great length to his brethren," reports miracles through the relics of Xavier.[2] Nay, during all these ten years, he admits that, as he pleasantly expresses himself, "abundant legends had already begun to grow elsewhere."[3] All this evidently is within the term of those

1 Dr. A. D. White's "Warfare of Science with Theology," vol. ii., ch. xiii., pp. 6-7.

2 Ibid. p. 12.

3 Ibid. p. 9.

thirty-five years, during which Dr. Douglas had said, not a miracle was heard of. Dr. White is a little recalcitrant in the face of his master.

Nor is that all. He is more liberal still. As he harps upon "contemporary documents" so much, we are naturally inquisitive to learn what he means by the term "contemporary." And, upon examination, we are taken aback at the large margin he allows us. He grants that witnesses or documents will be contemporary if they fall within any of three meanings which he assigns to that word.

First, Xavier's own writings, or the letters of his associates, are contemporary. In this sense, the word or its equivalent figures some dozen times within a few pages,[1] as we observed before.

Secondly, he gives us the idea of contemporary in such a phrase as this: "[Xavier's] associates during his life or during several years after his death."[2] And again he says: "Until about ten years after Xavier's death," the letters of the missionaries continued; and he describes them as "men who were supposed to be in the very thick of these miraculous manifestations."[3] He even goes so far as to recognize in the same category those who were "immediate successors of Xavier;" for he speaks of "the missionaries who had been co-workers or immediate successors of Xavier in his Eastern field;"[4] and thus he brings in the Jesuit Almeida. More than that, he allows that a man, who had never been in the East, and who was writing "nineteen years after Xavier's death," could be not only contemporary, "but the highest contemporary authority on the whole subject;" for that is how he describes Joseph Acosta.[5]

Thirdly, he gives a still wider meaning to the idea of contemporary. He mentions as witnesses "the natives upon whom he [Xavier] had wrought his miracles," and he joins with them at once "their children and grand-children." This testimony of the natives, their children and grand-children, he considers so good, that he merely distinguishes

1 Ibid. pp. 6–9. 2 P. 8. 3 P. 9. 4 P. 12. 5 P. 9.

it from any written testimony of theirs, which, he says, they could not give; for "certainly the ignorant natives of India and Japan did not commit any account of his miracles to writing."[1] This may be true, and it may be false. But all that we take note of is, that the oral testimony of children and grand-children is grouped by him with that of the natives on whom Xavier wrought his miracles. As the witness of these natives is contemporary, so he implies that the witness of their children and grand-children is contemporary likewise.

Now, we are quite aware that the Doctor never meant all this. But we are grateful nevertheless. These admissions escaped him when he was trying to make a point against somebody or something. But, having escaped him, they are ours; and we are thankful all the same. We might just take occasion here to remind him that it is very necessary, for him especially, to have a good memory. Memory alone would not make up for logic; but his logic will never march at all without the support of a very tenacious memory.

Hard as this is on Dr. Douglas, it is harder still on Dr. White, as we shall now see.

§ 2.

We come to the legend. Its foundation is given in these precise terms: "No account of a miracle wrought by him [Xavier] appears either in his own letters or in any contemporary document."[2] A dozen times this statement, in whole or in part, comprehensive or particular, is repeated by the Doctor, to make sure the web and woof on which the legend must be woven.

But let us pause a moment. The Doctor himself gives us accounts of miracles from "contemporary documents," or else oral witnesses; and that in the three orders covered by the term, "contemporary." First, he gives three from Xavier himself, merely by way of "example." Secondly, he reports miracles from Nuñez, Deyro, Father Pablo de

1 P 17. 2 P. 6.

Santa Fé, De Quadros, Almeida. Thirdly, he observes that Barreto, viceroy of India, was engaged by the King of Portugal to draw up "authentic accounts;" and he seems to imply that Barreto gathered "treasures of grace." What becomes of the Doctor's thesis, that "no account of a miracle wrought by him appears either in his own letters or in any contemporary document?"

The valiant author is ready. That was no slip of his. He has a witness on the stand prompt to deny each and every miracle reported by no matter whom. That witness is himself. It is true that he, living in the nineteenth century, does not enter into any of the categories of "contemporary" with St. Francis Xavier. But that does not matter.

He delivers his documentary witness in this style: "Only the most earnest devotee could claim anything like divine interposition" in the three examples derived from Xavier's own account. "They were few and feeble." "These were entirely from hearsay." "It was reported vaguely." They were "abundant legends." It was "an afterthought." It was "a subsidiary legend." As to John Deyro, who "said he knew that Xavier had the gift of prophecy," this man "Xavier himself had reprimanded and cast off for untruthfulness and dishonesty." A capital witness that, we should have thought; still not so good, it appears, as the Doctor himself! With regard to Barreto's official reports, the Doctor's own contemporary evidence despatches all of them, before they have time to get into writing: "We may well imagine," he says, with his usual imaginativeness, "what treasures of grace an obsequious viceroy, only too anxious to please a devout king, could bring together by means of the hearsay of ignorant, compliant natives through all the little towns of Portuguese India." This is very severe on little towns. Maybe the witness in a big town, like New York, would always be much more unimpeachably true! In short, it was all "thought of little value by those best able to judge."[1] So, too, has thought the Doctor; and he is emi-

1 Pages 6, 9, 12, 13, 17, 18.

nently able to judge. And Emanuel Acosta only wrote his commentaries "as an afterthought, nearly twenty years after Xavier's death!" Exactly; the Doctor is writing his commentaries, as an afterthought, nearly 350 years after those events.

We will submit it to the reader whether we were justified, on a former occasion, in stigmatizing the assumption which underlies all this, by saying, in face of the Doctor's refusal to accept sworn witnesses: "This will be quite consistent with the rest of his demonstration, and with the original assumption underlying all, which is that we are, on no account, to demur to his own testimony, albeit he is not a witness, nor is he sworn to deliver the truth."

Thus then the Doctor has rebutted, with his own testimony, the witness of all the world. That is not all. He has another witness—the Roman Catholic Church. This is startling. Yet the gentleman has his witness ready; and he produces it.

"In 1562, Julius Gabriel Eugubinus delivered a solemn oration on the condition and glory of the Church, before the papal legates and other fathers assembled at the Council of Trent;" but, "while he alluded to a multitude of things," he made not the remotest allusion to St. Francis Xavier's miracles. More than that: Julius Gabriel Eugubinus wrote letters to the foremost of the fathers assembled at Trent; and he says not a word about St. Francis Xavier's miracles. Worse still: "We have also a multitude of letters written from the Council by Bishops, Cardinals, and even by the Pope himself, discussing all sorts of Church affairs, and in not one of these is there evidence of the remotest suspicion that any of these reports, which they must have heard, regarding Xavier's miracles, were worthy of mention."[1] This is getting serious; for, of course, the Council of Trent was like the office of an editor, who is receiving his telegrams and sending them down post-haste to the compositor for the earliest morning edition of the daily paper on the glories of the

1 P. 13.

Church! But the Doctor has not finished. He charges right into the thick of the enemy, and says that Julius Gabriel Eugubinus "gives a Latin translation of a letter, 'on religious affairs in the Indies,' written by a Jesuit father twenty years after Xavier's death," "from a field very distant from that in which Xavier labored;" yet no "allusion appears" to the miracles wrought by Xavier—and this from a Jesuit father! All this he proves in a note, full of gravity: "For the work referred to, see *Julii Gabrielii* [sic] *Eugubini orationum et epistolarum*, etc., *libri duo* [*et*] *Epistola de rebus Indicis a quodam Societatis Jesu presbytero*, etc.:" Venetiis, 1569. The *Epistola* begins at fol. 44.[1]

Let us pause to draw breath, wondering the while, where in the world the erudite Doctor ever discovered his little book of Julius Gabriel Eugubinus, which has enabled him now to unearth the Council of Trent and betray that assembly to mankind?

Alas, poor Doctor! We could take him into the Vatican Archives and show him, not a little second-hand book, but 140 great folio tomes of speeches and acts of the Council of Trent. We would undertake to show him, not one speech of Julius Gabriel Eugubinus, but a hundred and fifty speeches by many others besides Eugubinus, wherein there is not a word about St. Francis Xavier. We could show him letters, another "multitude," and all of them original, not printed in a second-hand book, in which there is never a word about the miracles of St. Francis Xavier. We could exhibit letters from Bishops and Cardinals—all with the same sad qualification. One thing we could not show him—we humbly confess it—we could not show him letters, neither a "multitude" of them, nor even one, "written by the Pope himself from the Council." That passes our powers. We think it would transcend the abilities even of the Bollandists and of all the students together in the Vatican archives. It will take an ex-professor of history at Cornell University to dive so deep into history, and to become such a man of mark, as to find

1 P. 13, 14.

letters written from the Council of Trent by a Pope who was never there! The erudite world has not the equal of Dr. Andrew Dickson White in legendary lore. There he is without a peer.

But, seriously, is that all he knows about the Council? Then, if he did find his little second-hand volume, what about the translation, the grammar, the parsing? Has he done with Julius Gabriel's Latin what he did with Joseph Acosta's? And has he treated the Latin translation of the letter, written by a Jesuit Father, away "in a field very distant from that in which Xavier labored," with the same accuracy, fidelity and scrupulous regard for truth, with which he signalized his performance on the other Jesuit writing in Peru, 12,000 miles away from the East Indies?

Considerations like these, and others of a graver order still, however much beneath the notice of the ex-professor of history and the present Ambassador to Germany, have acquired such a control over more ordinary minds, that we fear a mutual understanding is hopeless on the present question. Our ordinary minds are not yet prepared, any more than a certain judge was, to admit as juridical evidence the plea of that spirited criminal who, when pressed too hard by eye-witnesses, professed and propounded to the court, as Dr. White is now doing to us, that "for every one of the witnesses they could bring to testify that they had seen him commit the crime, he could bring ten to testify that they had not seen him commit it." We are not yet prepared for this manner of demonstration. Dr. White is too spirited for us. So we must concede to the Doctor without reserve all the glories and emoluments of his little second-hand volume on Julius Gabriel Eugubinus.

§3.

But he shrieks, and twelve times does the shriek rend the air: "No account of a miracle wrought by him appears either in his own letters or in any contemporary document." And he turns upon us in a monitory note, full of severity: "This statement was denied with much explosive emphasis

by a writer in the *Catholic World* for September and October 1891, but he brought no *fact* to support this denial. I may perhaps be allowed to remind the reverend writer that since the days of Pascal, whose eminence in the Church he will hardly dispute, the bare assertion of even a Jesuit Father against established facts needs some support other than mere scurrility."[1]

We feel humbled and intimidated. Not only Dr. White and Alfred Maury, but Pascal is now upon our hands. We must try to excuse ourselves.

Will then our "bare assertion" be humbly allowed to stand, if we adduce in support of it the testimony of Dr. A. D. White? He supports it for us by giving us first three contemporary facts; then nine; then the whole series of Barreto's contemporary facts, reduced into verbal processes for service at Rome; then the series of "ten great miracles,"[2] selected by Cardinal Del Monte from a great number juridically examined over again, and all taken from the sworn depositions of eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses contemporary with Xavier. Will this support from Dr. White satisfy Dr. White? Or will he discard even that? We had indeed adduced a long page and a half of eye and ear testimonies to Xavier's gift of tongues, all taken from the official document, called *Relatio super Sanctitate et Miraculis Francisci Xaverii.*[3] But we do not pretend to defend ourselves, except where Dr. White supports us; the more so, as our tastes differ so much from his in many respects. For instance, he makes merry over the "pious crab,"[4] which brought back to Xavier the crucifix lost overboard. Now we, on the contrary, would almost speak reverentially of a "pious crab," in comparison with an impious man; we should prefer any day to have a crab's "piety" rather than a human being's impiety. For of the impious man it has been said: "It had been better for him he had never been born;" and that has never been said of a crab, still less of a "pious" one.

1 Ibid. p. 6.

2 Ibid. p. 14.

3 *Cath. World*, Oct. 1891, pp. 30–2.

4 P. 20 text and p. 21. note.

And does the Doctor now fly to Pascal for protection against the consequence of his own revelations? He should not have made them. He should have kept to his originals, to Dr. Douglas and the vicar of Templebodane, and all the rest of them—he ought to have prevaricated, he ought to have done so stoutly, and clung to his prevarication stubbornly. Then he could have stood alone, as Pascal has stood, since he perpetrated his feats in that line two centuries ago.

And what is this "Church," in which Pascal is so eminent? We did not know the Doctor had any Church. He told us so in his Introduction, that he had risen against all Churches and against all "sweet reasonableness." We had taken him to be a Voltairian of the latest generation, that is, evolved through Darwinism. We had our reasons for this. Finding that he blasphemed in every chapter, that he ridiculed the Bible from Genesis to the Apocalypse, that he dragged the name of "the Lord Jesus Christ," as Renan, as Strauss, drag that sacred Name in the mire, we had reasons for putting him down as a Voltairian of this latest generation, which, having neither faith nor science nor literature any more, recognizes no other principle than that of making money, and making books to make the money with.

This gentleman should not charge us with "deliberate misrepresentation."[1] No, he does not charge us with it; he says he will not; for he is too much of a gentleman. So are we. We will not charge him with deliberate misrepresentation. We consider that his word always carries with it voucher enough for the sincerity, fidelity and truth which distinguish him. We only say that, to establish his libellous accounts of St. Francis Xavier and of the Church of Rome generally, he ought to have made deliberate misrepresentations, he ought to have stuck to them stoutly, and then he would have needed no Pascal to support his sinking spirits. But he will call this again "scurrilous." We cannot help that. We do not stand sponsors for anything that the Doctor says; nor for any name he gives to any creature in heaven or on earth;

1 P. 17, note.

nor for his long drawn-out blasphemy against the Creator of heaven and earth.

But, as the author of the *Warfare of Science with Theology* takes things quite pleasantly and lightly, our readers, too, will take a pleased interest in learning, by what possible process he has ever managed to build up a legend on the shifting sand he has chosen, where, if he finds a solid footing at all, he must needs cede it to the cause he has undertaken to demolish.

It is a very simple and easy process. It is that of infallible assurance. He makes eleven or more declarations—we might say in his own apt terms, he makes them "with explosive emphasis"—that Xavier says nothing, that Xavier's associates say nothing, that Xavier's contemporaries say nothing, etc. Why Xavier himself, being a Saint, should say nothing about his miracles and gifts, we thought an easy matter of explanation, when we wrote six years ago; and the learned Bollandist says a word upon that subject in his recent article.[1] But, as to the associates, whom the Doctor harps on so much, he should have told us who they were. How many of them travelled with the Saint on his solitary and lonely journeys from one part of India to another, from India to Japan, from Japan back towards India? We are not aware that any troop of associates waited on the Saint. History is not aware of it either. We find that the few scattered Jesuit missionaries, oftentimes as lonely as the Saint himself, are quite reserved in communicating the first news they receive of the wonderful deeds reported.

Cries the Doctor: His fellow-missionaries never say a word! If they did not, what has that to do with "established facts?"[i] But they do; and the Rev. Bollandist gives quite a series of them.[2]

But, says the Doctor, the great "typical collection" of letters, given by Emanuel Acosta, contains no account of miracles: "The letters in it were written by Xavier and his

1 Analecta Bollandiana, tom xvi., pp. 57-8.

2 Anal. Boll., as above, pp. 58-60.

associates not only from Goa, which was the focus of all missionary effort and the centre of all knowledge regarding their work in the East, but from all other important points in the great field. The first of them were written during the Saint's lifetime, but, though filled with every sort of detail regarding missionary life and work, they say nothing regarding any miracle of Xavier."[1] We are prone to imagine that the Doctor found this collection alone, as representative of all other collections, and magnified it duly; just as he found Julius Gabriel Eugubinus alone as representative of the Council of Trent, and amplified him accordingly. He pretends indeed to know something of other collections; for he adds: "The same is true of various other collections published during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries." This is like his knowledge of the correspondence issuing from the Council of Trent, and of the "Pope writing from the Council." We leave him here in the hands of the learned Bollandist, who shows him where he might have made a fuller selection.

All that we remark on is the fidelity of the gentleman, who, telling his readers that "the first of these [letters in Emanuel Acosta's collection] were written during the Saint's lifetime," does not tell them how many there are in Acosta to answer this description. One would think there was a legion of them. Out of forty, there are just five, besides two from St. Francis Xavier himself. He says: they are "filled with every sort of detail regarding missionary life and work."

Let us just see. Two of the five are from Paul the Japanese, in one of which he gives an account of his own life and conversion to the faith; and in the other, which, as it stands in Acosta, is an extremely short note, he speaks about the conversion of his family. Two are from Cosmas Torres; the first about his own vocation to the Society, the other about the missionary labors in Japan, whither he had gone with St. Francis Xavier. Finally, there is one from

[1] P 8.

Juan Fernandez, written again from Japan to St. Francis Xavier himself! That is all; and this is the "typical collection," which, by what it does not contain, is to gainsay what other collections do contain.

Emanuel Acosta himself did not give it forth as a "typical" collection, if by "typical" the Doctor means complete. He made a selection, not only of letters, but of parts of letters, for fear his book should be too large; and he reduced all the substance of the entire Indian correspondence into a preparatory commentary, where everything might be found, without the desultoriness of epistolary style. The Doctor seems to have seen something inconvenient, with regard to miracles, in this commentary of Emanuel Acosta; for he refers very lightly to it at the end of his legend, saying: "commentaries written as an afterthought nearly twenty years after Xavier's death."[1] This was quite an afterthought of the Doctor's, at the end of his legend. We would recommend to an historian like him the little effort of forethought, which would consist in reading the very first pages of the book he is consulting. There on the reverse of folio 5, he could have read, in the dedicatory espistle of the Latin translator, addressing Cardinal Truchses: "It seems to me that Emanuel, whose work we translate, was both prudent and faithful in retrenching what seemed not so necessary, and then condensing all the rest into a brief commentary, to put in readiness and at hand, whatever seemed most worthy of written record, for such as desired to be informed of the state and progress of Indian affairs, under the aspect of religion." And the translator says, that he too has retrenched further, without prejudice to the substance.[2] The translator addresses the Cardinal from Rome, 15 Kalen. Decembris MDLXX. This is the identical edition which our author has consulted

1 P. 17.

2 Rerum a Societate Jesu in Oriente gestarum, ad annum usque a Deipara Virgine MDLXVIII., commentarius Emanuelis Acostae Lusitani, recognitus et latinitate donatus: accessere de Japonicis rebus epistolarum libri iiii., item recogniti, et in latinum ex Hispanico sermone conversi. Dilingae, apud Sebaldum Mayer, anno MDLXXI.

in the Royal Library at Munich.[1] But the hurry he must have been in while consulting it in a foreign library was like the hurry he must have been in when writing his ill-digested chapters on ocean steamers or on the Nile. And other considerations must have made him anxious to shut the commentary up in the most expeditious manner possible.

For, on folio 4, is the letter of John III. to the viceroy, enjoining on him the citation of competent witnesses,[2] the drawing up of authentic verbal processes from the depositions,[3] and moreover the entering of the whole process itself into the public records.[4] The witnesses are to be cited from all the regions where there are any persons thoroughly conversant with the facts,[5] and they are to reply to the interrogations under oath.[6] After giving the letter, Acosta goes on to say: "On the arrival of the King's letter in India, the ministers executed the orders with care, and sent to the King such an amount of information, exactly sifted and certified, that it would take too long for us to rehearse all here."[7] Nevertheless to a series of miracles and prophecies he devotes folios 8 to 12.

It is just in the same way that Cardinal Del Monte, in the Papal Consistory of January 19, 1622, introduces the miracles thus: "Out of many miracles which are contained in the processes, and were wrought during life and after death by the Servant of God, Xavier, we have selected these few." And he gives ten of those wrought during life, and thirteen after death; the first of these latter is Xavier's body remaining incorrupt after death, of which we shall hear more anon. Then the Cardinal goes on to "Miraculous Predictions,"

1 P. 11, note.

2 Idonei testes.

3 Tabulas publicas seu authentica instrumenta.

4 Ipsamet iniquisitio in publica monimenta recte atque ordine referatur.

5 Omnibus istis in regionibus, quicunque earum rerum probe conscii extiterint.

6 Jurati ad interrogata respondeant.

7 Fol. 4 verso: ita multa probe comperta atque explorata miserunt, ut singula hoc loco persequi nimis longum sit.

saying: "Of the miraculous predictions of this Servant of God, we shall report some of the more principal ones;" and he recounts seven.[1] And, before he comes to these selections, he puts on record, in the true style of that canonical jurisprudence in which was cradled the civil jurisprudence of Christendom, the series of official processes, now issuing in this summary Relation. The steps were these:

Sixty years after Xavier's death, "when the fame of his sanctity and miracles was in the mouth of the whole Christain world," Paul V., yielding to the supplication of the Society of Jesus, commissioned the Cardinals of the Congregation of Rites to take cognizance of and examine[2] the original processes, drawn up by the Ordinary of the Indies, of Goa, of Cochin, of Bazain and Malaca, at the instance of John, King of Portugal; and determine the preliminary question, whether the fame of Xavier's sanctity and miracles, and the devotion of peoples to him, was such as to warrant further steps. First, Cardinal Pamfili, then after his death, Cardinal Lancelot, presided over this preliminary investigation, conducted by three Auditors of the Rota, whom Del Monte names, and two notaries, one succeeding on the death of the other. The articles regarding the alleged fame of Xavier were produced by a legitimate procurator. Twelve witnesses were examined on this general question of Xavier's fame for sanctity and miracles, *cum interrogatoriis et servatis aliis de jure servandis.* The original processes were produced; they were faithfully interpreted; they were acknowledged to be in form. Finally, the Sacred Congregation of Rites, on the report of Cardinal Lancelot, decided the preliminary and general question in the affirmative, and that now an examination could be instituted on the particulars. Wherefore, Paul V. issued another rescript, commissioning the same three Auditors to resume the cause, examine all the acts and processes;

1 Relatio facta in Consistorio secreto, coram S. D. N. Gregorio Papa XV., A Francisco Maria, etc. S. R. E. Card. A. Monte, die xix. Januarii, MDCXXII., super vita, sanctitate, actis canonizationis, et miraculis, B. Francisci Xavier, Societatis Jesu. Insulis, MDCXXII. Pages 32–60.

2 Super recognitione processuum . . . inquirerent et referrent.

despatch official and authoritative letters,[1] as had been done in the former stage, to the Archbishop of Goa, to the Bishops of Pampeluna, Bayonne, to the Bishop of Cochin, to the Bishop of Malacca, or their respective Vicars. Meanwhile, the case was begun over again at Rome, in the particular or special investigation; and other witnesses were cited and examined according to legal forms. The report came back from the authorities commissioned at a distance, and were faithfully interpreted, were produced and examined. Then, at the instance of the procurator of the Society of Jesus, speaking in the name of the King of Spain, and of many other Princes, and of the whole clergy of India, the cause was advanced to a new stage. Many assemblies of the Sacred Congregation of Rites were held; and, taking up point after point in the premises and all the processes, the three Auditors declared that everything therein was legitimate and legal, that the witnesses for the depositions had been duly and rightly examined, and that the evidence stood, *esse in forma probanti;* and that all the virtues and actions of Xavier had been investigated in all particulars, *per particularia dubia.* And a report thereof was made to the same Paul V. This report his successor, Gregory XV., returned to the Congregation, which then in many sessions "diligently and accurately discussed the assertions and conclusions of the Auditors, and unanimously decided: That all the aforesaid processes were authentic and valid; as they also decided: That all the proofs contained in those processes, regarding the sanctity, excellence of faith and striking miracles[2] of the Servant of God Francis Xavier, were legitimate and sufficient. Now if Your Holiness judges them to be so, and to suffice for canonization, I will proceed to what remains to be said in the third place, giving a brief sketch of his miracles in particular."[3]

In all these canonical processes, special notice is to be taken of one person and his functions. That is the *promotor*

1 Litteras remissoriales et compulsoriales.

2 Praeclaris miraculis. 3 Card. Del Monte, above, pp. 28–32.

*fidei*, popularly called the "devil's advocate," who allows no jot or tittle to pass without challenge. The achievements of this individual are famous. He does with causes what grand inquisitors did with heresies. Probably all great men of the courts who have mounted to the Cardinalate and to the Papal Throne have signalized their abilities here. Benedict XIV., himself *promotor fidei* at one time, gives instances of their exceptions in his well-known treatise on Heroic Virtue; and we cited an example from him when we wrote before,[1] of an exception taken by Picenino to the proof of St. Francis Xavier's Gift of Tongues, which, as Benedict XIV. added, "Cardinal Gotti vigorously refuted," and conclusively. Whether for the performances of the "devil's advocate," or for the verbal processes of the testimonies, we could alike refer Dr. A. D. White or any one else to the printed volumes which are to be found at large libraries, especially throughout Europe. We have under our own eyes now some five hundred such volumes.[2]

Dr. White seems to have had this Relation of Cardinal Del Monte in his hands.[3] His purpose in quoting the Cardinal's list of ten miracles would appear to be chiefly for the sake of making merry at the expense of the "pious" crab. The rest he was in too great a hurry to see. Possibly he was writing "in a boat on the Nile"[4] at the time. He consulted Emanuel Acosta in the library at Munich. He was in a very great hurry. He slammed the book, and ran away from the library with the identical notion which he had carried into the library with him; and then he went and wrote "on an Atlantic steamer."[5] It is a pity his readers, too, are not on an Atlantic steamer, or in a boat on the Nile!

## § 5.

We ought now to follow the Doctor through the imaginative construction of his legend, growing from Maffei to Tur-

1 *Cath. World*, Oct. 1891, p. 28.

2 In the library of the Bollandists.

3 P. 21, note.

4 Dr. White's Introduction.

5 Ibid.

sellini, to the "life of Vitelleschi," to Bouhours. But, as all the imaginative foundation of the legend has disappeared, it could afford us nothing but amusement. Our instincts put restraints upon us here; and our space puts still more. We quoted Maffei textually, and we quoted Tursellini textually, showing that they themselves contradicted the Doctor's gratuitous assumptions in their regard. But they were necessary for his legend. So we find them in his book with the same libels pinned to them which the Doctor's ingenuity had devised for them in his article. We told him there was no Life of Xavier written by Vitelleschi. He changed his text accordingly; but appended thereto a comic interlude, if not rather something tragic, which perhaps merits a word here.

In the former edition, he had spoken of the Life written in 1622, "by Father Vitelleschi;"[1] he had said again: "Vitelleschi, in his Life of Xavier."[2] Now Fr. Vitelleschi could have written no life in 1622. He had been General of the Society during seven years already; and a General can find no leisure for writing Lives. We said to the Doctor: "Who is Vitelleschi, that wrote a Life of St. Francis Xavier? There is no such person and no such Life."[3] Hereupon, in his new edition, the Doctor has done something which we do not altogether like. In each of the two places, he slips quite a different phrase into the text, saying of the Life, that it was "published under the sanction of Vitelleschi."[4] Now we have no objection to that; for it was to put the gentleman on the right path that we vouchsafed our friendly criticism. But the note, which the gentleman adds here—that is what jars on our critical sense. He says: "The writer in the *Catholic World*, already mentioned, rather rashly asserts that there is no such Life of Xavier as that I have above quoted;" and then he expands at some length. Now really we had never made any such rash assertion; for the gentle-

1 *Popular Science Monthly*, May, 1891, 6 p. 2 Ibid. p. 7.
3 *Cath. World*, Sept. 1891, p. 845.
4 White's *Warfare*, etc., ibid. p. 15.

man had never made any such quotation. We could not deny what he had not yet written. We denied only what he himself has now denied, by introducing so quietly that agreeable change into his text. He is free to introduce changes into his production. We would exhort him to put in many more. He may even do so surreptitiously. We have no objection to all that. The only open question between the Doctor and mankind generally is upon the propriety of basing an attack upon a surreptitious and masked manœuvre of self-justification. As to the rest of his expansive note, that we "have evidently glanced over the bibliographies of Carayon and De Backer, and not finding it there under the name of Vitelleschi have spared ourselves further trouble," by which remark the Doctor retorts our own argument against his whole manner of composition; to this our only rejoinder is, that there is no need of resorting to Dr. White's methods, in order to answer Dr. White. Since he now favors us, in his new edition, with the full title of this "Life of Fr. Vitelleschi," we recognize it as the sketch by Fr. Soprani. There is such a book. And, if as good use be made of it in future, as we augur for Joseph Acosta in the library of Cornell University, we may congratulate ourselves on the very best results.

He takes up Bouhours, who wrote 130 years after St. Francis Xavier's death; and he devotes about three pages to the "evolution of legend" in Fr. Bouhour's popular Life. It is to be regretted that the Doctor does not find a biography of the Saint written in the year 1897. We believe it would have added a complete stage to his edifice. Having at hand to-day the huge mass of processes, which were already available in Bouhour's time; possessing besides the immense literature on the Saint now at the world's disposal; a modern writer could strike out on a line of his own, make new detours through all that material; he could with literary art adjust new combinations in assorting it, and make special features salient by the situations he selected in it; and he could do all this, with such effect, well known indeed in the literary world of biography, that the same ignorant passer-by, who had thought before that no new life could be written

effectively of a great personage, would cry out afterwards: This is all so new, it must be legend! Who knows but a biographer may yet supply the Doctor with a new stage to his edifice?

Let us give an example, and close with it, of this "wavering" line, as the Doctor speaks, or this "growing" plant, as the Doctor terms it, or this "evolution" to which he is so devoted.

Telling how the story of the resurrections wrought by Xavier had grown and wavered, betwixt one author and another, he had said in his first edition: "In 1622, at the canonization proceedings, three were mentioned; but by the time of Father Bouhours there were twenty-five."[1] Whereupon we remarked: "Charming! As if the twenty-five had evolved out of the three! In 1715 (that is, nearly a hundred years later still), the number was not twenty-five but twenty-seven, recognized, says D'Aurignac, by the court of Rome at that date; but of the twenty-seven 'fourteen had been wrought within a few years' previous to this date of 1715." D'Aurignac continues: At the same date, 1715, 'the Bishop of Malacca had authenticated eight hundred miracles in his diocese alone.' "Our legendary evolution," we continued, "imagines that all had developed out of an original small stock, an original suggestion, so to say, of protoplasmic legend."[2] It was thus we replied to the Doctor. In the new edition, the gentleman drops down rather seriously from his original "twenty-five" to "fourteen!"—as we might express our selves in Miltonian phrase, "plumb down he drops!" He says: "In 1622, at the canonization proceedings, three were mentioned; but by the time of Father Bouhours there were fourteen—all raised from the dead during his lifetime—and the name, place, and circumstances are given with much detail in each case."[3] We should have thought that pretty good. Not so the Doctor, who thinks it very bad to be in a quandary. So he issues

1 *Popular Science Monthly*, May, 1891, p. 8.

2 *Cath. World*, Sept., 844.

3 White's *Warfare*, etc., p. 17.

out of it by means of a monitory note to us. Whenever Dr. White is in bankruptcy he issues monitory notes. He says: "The writer in the *Catholic World*, already referred to, has based an attack here upon a misconception—I will not call it a deliberate misrepresentation—of his own by stating that these resurrections occurred after Xavier's death, and were due to his intercession or the use of his relics. This statement of the Jesuit father is utterly without foundation, as a simple reference to Bouhours will show." Then he flourishes a long list of Bouhours' pages in our face.

We understand the Doctor perfectly. We should like him indeed to be scrupulous about the truth; but, with the three passages now before the reader, we think it unnecessary to formulate our own impressions on that estimable and delicate virtue. All that we say now is, that, if he will just add the fourteen which he has discovered so minutely in Bouhours, to the fourteen which D'Aurignac supplied, he will arrive at twenty-eight, pretty near D'Aurignac's number, and sufficiently different from Dr. White's original twenty-five to recommend its insertion in the third edition of his valuable legend. It will introduce another "wavering" line of beauty into the varied imagery which already adorns it. As to the arithmetic involved, we have nothing to do with it. D'Aurignac will supply the figures; but Dr. White is the expert there: first, twenty-five; now, fourteen; probably, twenty-eight to-morrow.

There was once a poetic fiend whom a poetic genius described thus:

> As in a cloudy chair, ascending rides
> Audacious; but, that seat soon failing, meets
> A vast vacuity: all unawares,
> Fluttering his pennons vain, plumb down he drops
> Ten thousand fathom deep, and to this hour
> Down had been falling, had not . . .

The rest of the quotation we shall see in sober prose, when the Evolution so far considered, and the Devolution which followed, shall enter into its third edition. In the mean-

time, we shall assist the Doctor in his perilous career with some directive principles of criticism. Of them in our next.[1]

THOMAS HUGHES, S. J.

*Brussels, Belgium.*

1 To help the Doctor in his arithmetical development, we beg to supply him with some new figures, though at the cost of introducing him to a new book, with unknown risks to ourselves. The advocate who spoke in the public consistory before the Pope, nine days after Cardinal Del Monte's oration in the secret consistory, expressed himself thus: "Now the miracles wrought by him [Xavier], both during life and after death, were so numerous, so varied and so brilliant, that Xavier may certainly be said not to have fallen short even of the great Apostles themselves. To pass over other categories, the dead who were brought back to life, number in the Acts not fewer than twenty, although in the Relation produced before Your Holiness only four of them are mentioned," etc. Jam vero miracula per illum tum viventem, tum vita functum, patrata divinitus, tam multa, tam varia, tamque insignia sunt, ut profecto Xaverius nihil fecisse minus a magnis Apostolis affirmari possit. Certe mortui ad vitam restituti, ut caetera taceam, quamvis in relatione habita coram Sanctitate Vestra quatuor tantummodo numerentur, tamen non pauciores quam viginti in Actis proferuntur," etc. Oratio Nicolai Lambeccari Consistorialis aulae advocati, etc., etc., coram SSmo. D. N. Gregorio XV. in publico Consistorio etc., die xxvii. Januarii, MDCXXII: Romae, Barthol. Zanetti, etc. MDCXXII. In 4to., pp. 1–22: page 18.

# IV.

## History at Cornell University.

### Some Canons of Criticism for Dr. White's Legend.

---

THE interesting author who has afforded us so much entertainment recently with his Warfare betwixt Science and Theology, has also taken us into his confidence. He informs us that he is reserving and nourishing several pious intentions. One is that of writing more at large on St. Francis Xavier. He says: "I have compared, for a more extended discussion of this subject hereafter, a very great number of editions of these and other biographies of the Saint, with speeches at the canonization, the bull of Gregory XV., various books of devotion, and a multitude of special writings, including a large mass of material in the Royal Library at Munich and in the British Museum," etc. And then he speaks of "the pious crab."[1] Another intention of his he confidentially makes known to us, while careering on his fourteenth round, under the bulletin: "From Fetich to Hygiene." He says: "In another series of chapters on the Warfare of *Humanity with Theology*, I hope to go more fully into the subject."[2]

We are thankful to the gentleman for his expansive confidence; and we enter fully into his intentions. To show our appreciation, we feel that we should help with our advice.

1 Dr. A. D. White's *Warfare of Science with Theology*, vol. ii., p. 21, note.

2 Ibid., ch. 14, p. 78, note.

Indeed, as we too belong to Humanity, we might almost venture to think that we have a right to a word. For we live under a representative form of government, and not under a Napoleonic autocracy dominated by Dr. A. D. White. Candidly, we never did like Napoleon. But somehow we like the autocracy of Dr. White still less. For Napoleon, with all his campaigning proclivities, was still a man of several ideas. Dr. White has only one. And, possessed with that peculiar fanaticism which harasses the man of one idea, now that he has discharged his idea at "Theology" from one side—a side, which for some private reason not yet explained he has called "Science"—he threatens another discharge of his very peculiar idea from another side, which, for a reason similarly abstruse, he is going to call "Humanity."

Our advice, which we feel constrained to give, will take its direction, not toward Humanity, nor Science, nor Theology, but toward Dr. Andrew Dickson White; and the direction whence it comes is from what is commonly called "History." We mean history, not legends. And we shall propound it in four canons, duly approved by higher criticism. And, lest it should be too general if only put into formulas, we shall reinforce it with particular instances. These we shall take exclusively from the Evolution of Dr. White's Legend on St. Francis Xavier's miracles.

## §1.

We would respectfully submit to the ex-historian of Cornell University these four principles of historical criticism: First, never to make an assumption without first seeing where it will land him; or else he may have to discard it, before he has finished his lucubration. Secondly, scrupulously to correct an evident falsity when once it is pointed out to him; or else, from a falsity, it will evolve into a falsehood. Thirdly, never to quote an author in any language whatever, not only a dead one like Latin, but neither a living one like French, for what that author does not contain. Fourthly,

to be very willing to look palpable evidence in the face without flinching or even wincing; we would even recommend an exhibition of cordiality to such an honest visitor as palpable and manifest evidence. At all events, if cordiality is too much to expect of human nature when under the high tension of a solitary and lonely idea, we would strongly urge the practice of respectful toleration. All this advice would be quite superfluous in the province of real history; but it is not so in the literature of legendary evolution. And we propose to show by instances the practical value of our remarks.

First, the author makes a couple of assumptions to build up his legend about St. Francis Xavier: first, that no biographer finds at any time sources of information which a preceding writer did not use; secondly, and this is the complement of the former, that such subsequent biographer is building up his history only on the published books of those who went before him. Dr. White does not state that he makes these assumptions. It is not necessary that he should, for they constitute the whole skeleton of his legend.

Now, both of these assumptions he has to discard when he is endeavoring to guard some flank or other or to win some advantage. He discards the first when desiring to make capital out of Bouhours; for he says: "Bouhours, writing ninety years after Tursellinus, could not have had access to any new sources. Xavier had been dead one hundred and thirty years, and of course all the natives upon whom he had wrought his miracles, and their children and grandchildren, were gone;" etc.[1] This criterion the author introduces, for the first time, at a point one hundred and thirty years after Xavier's death; therefore we infer that, according to the Doctor's idea, it would have been possible for earlier writers to have had access to new sources. Exactly. Then, what becomes of the evolutionary legend founded on the contrary assumption? Moreover, Bouhours did not live one

1 P. 17.

hundred and thirty years after the processes of canonization; they were only sixty years before, not to mention the facts and miracles concerning Xavier, which were altogether new and were contemporary even with Bouhours. The records of the canonization proceedings could have become public property only within sixty years before; therefore, thirty years after Tursellini. Hence Bouhours had all this mine of eye-witness and ear-witness contemporary with Xavier, all made public property when Tursellini could not use it. What then becomes of the entire upper story of the legendary edifice which is constructed out of Bouhours exclusively, as compared with Tursellini, and with those who were earlier still?

This shows that the Doctor should not have made the other complementary assumption; which is that every biographer builds exclusively on his predecessors. The gentleman himself discards this several times. First, speaking of Tursellini's *Life of Xavier*, published in 1594, he says that in this Life the biographer "appears to have made the first large use of the information collected by the Portuguese viceroy and the more zealous brethren."[1] Therefore, Tursellini did not build on Maffei; and yet the two are contrasted, as showing the evolution of legend. Secondly, speaking of the resurrection wrought by Xavier, the Doctor says that, in various authors, "the story wavers between one and two cases; finally, in the time of Tursellinus, four cases had been developed."[2] If then the story "wavered," they were not following one another. Again he goes on to say: "In 1622, at the canonization proceedings, three were mentioned."[3] Now the canonization proceedings came nearly thirty years after Tursellini. Hence they certainly were not following the biographers merely; for, instead of Tursellini's four, they include, as mentioned, only three.—That is enough for the Doctor; and the entire skeleton of his legend is discarded by himself.

1 P. 14. 2 P. 17. 3 Ibid.

But it is not enough for us. What does the Doctor know about the canonization proceedings? He has evidently never seen them. He means Cardinal Del Monte's speech, or the Bull of Canonization. But, in these two documents, only a "selection" was made, as both of them expressly say. The Doctor would seem to imply, that only three were to be had; for he says, as against Tursellini's four, only "three were mentioned." But, three pages earlier he himself had said, they were only a selection: Cardinal Del Monte, says he, "selects out ten great miracles," among which are the dead "raised in various places"; that is, miracles 2, 3 and 5, of the ten wrought by Xavier during his lifetime. What does the Doctor mean by all this "wavering" line of logic? Does he know what he is driving at? His general assumptions he discards; and then he discards the particular assumptions, with which he tries to prove them.

§ 2.

The second canon of criticism which we respectfully submit to him is, that he should correct an evident falsity when once it is pointed out to him; or else, from a falsity, it will evolve, after Darwinian fashion, into a falsehood;—we might even add a greater inconvenience still: or else the falsehood will be driven home.

The Doctor had said, in his first edition, that the Jesuit Father Maffei, in the year 1588, published his *History of India*, but, "though he gave a biography of Xavier which shows fervent admiration for his subject, he dwelt very lightly on the alleged miracles." Here in the new edition, to give all the piquancy possible to the falsity he is reiterating, he pins in a special sentence: "But the evolution of miraculous legends still went on." Then, resuming the first edition, he goes on: "Six years later, in 1594, Father Tursellinus published his *Life of Xavier*;" and, after stating that here there was "a vast increase in the number of miracles over those given by all sources together up to that time," he finds it necessary for his legend to say, only two pages further on:

"Miracles few and small in Tursellinus became many and great in Bouhours."[1]

Now all this would serve to illustrate our previous canon of criticism, how he assumes, and then drops his assumptions, and has need of a more tenacious memory than he seems to have been gifted with by nature. But we take the passages up as exemplifying our second canon.

We devoted three pages to showing him textually from these authors, that they precisely contradicted him.[2] First, Maffei wrote no biography of Xavier, when he wrote a History of India; nevertheless, having followed the progress of Xavier in the course of his History of India, the historian closes the episode in these terms: "Others recounted his infallible predictions and miracles—many more, indeed, than we have touched upon, hurrying on, as we have done, to fulfill another purpose."[3] But Maffei, coming only thirty-six years after Xavier's death, the classic period assigned to Dr. White by his original, Dr. Douglas, Bishop of Salisbury, pertains to the groundwork of the legendary theory, the negative basis of "silence" regarding Xavier's miracles. And therefore Maffei must remain. And he does remain, still pilloried to the falsehood on page 14 of Dr. White's new edition.

Secondly, with regard to the "miracles few and small in Tursellinus," we took the very special pains of designating chapter and verse in the Doctor's Tursellini, and showing him recorded there "fifty-one distinct miracles and prophecies, besides summaries of others, all before Xavier's death." We added: "In the following chapter, he recounts nine distinct prodigies, besides summaries of others, all after death. Among the prodigies distinctly recorded by Tursellini are most of those subsequently chosen by the court of Rome for juridical examination, on which to base the process of canonization." Further, we called the Doctor's attention to the *Praefatio ad Lectorem* in Tursellini's edition of 1596, where

1 *The Popular Science Monthly*, May, 1891, pp. 6–7; White's *Warfare*, etc., vol. ii., pp. 14 and 16.

2 *The Catholic World*, Sept., 1891, pp. 839–842.

3 Lib. xv., p. 668, Edit. Cadoni, 1614.

the author tells of the new acquisitions he has made since his edition of two years before: "a part of Xavier's history, as narrated by those who at the time were in China or Japan." And, to make the Doctor feel quite at home henceforth with his Tursellini, although at the cost of having to turn his legend out of doors, we refreshed his critical sense with the passage at the beginning of Tursellini's sixth book, where a whole chapter is devoted to the question of "the authentic character of the records, the sworn testimonies, the access he has had to them, and other points regarding testimony, truth and fidelity, which it would be quite in harmony with the interests of science to bring before the notice of popular writers to-day, of *vulgarisateurs* in magazines, if only they thought it worth their while to regard such indifferent matters." But, we added, "probably they will not." And our surmise has proved true. We recognize, indeed, that Maffei and Tursellini had to remain, if the Doctor's legend was not to go. Still we must repeat our canon of historical criticism, and, putting it under another form, say to the gentleman, that the end does not justify the means, even in so trifling a matter as conveying the truth.

## § 3.

Our third canon is, never to quote an author for what he does not say—not only if he be a Jesuit writing in Latin, but not even if he be an infidel writing in French.

To satisfy the Doctor's peremptory demand for contemporary testimony, we presented a page and a half of contemporary witnesses for Xavier's Gift of Tongues. The summary contained some nine depositions, beside "several others" for a specific point. It is, says Father Coleridge, the "short epitome of the argument, as summarily presented by the Auditors of the Rota in their chapter on this subject."[1] As to the ingenious objections raised by the Doctor in his former edition, which have now become inepitudes in his present

1 *Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier*, by Rev. J. H. Coleridge, S. J., vol. i., book ii., ch. ii., p. 173, edit. of 1886.

repetition, we pointed out the exact legal state of the question, and how his very original difficulties were now almost three centuries old! The "devil's advocate" had thought them out, and brought them up against St. Francis Xavier's cause. But we quoted Benedict XIV., telling how Cardinal Gotti had "vigorously" laid the "devil's advocate" low. Dreadful men are those "devil's advocates" in Rome, men of wit, ability and genius; and they can not only detect the remotest shadow of an objection to be made, but they have the ability also to see when it is answered. To pique the ambition of our advocate, who "writes in a boat on the Nile or on an Atlantic steamer," in order that he too might rise to the splendor of a similar performance, we said, with a mischievous little flourish, after giving the contemporary evidence for Xavier's Gift of Tongues: "We may presume that this little specimen of evidence is enough to exercise the acumen of any legal expert."[1]

Dr. White was piqued. So he did three things. First, he left everything just as it stood. Secondly, he found a new argument in Joseph Acosta. Thirdly, as there were all the juridical processes of canonization on the subject, he went over to his little note on Alfred Maury, and "the worthlessness of the testimony to miracles presented during the canonization proceedings at Rome," and he added this significant little etiquette: "pp. 4–7," to his citation from "Maury, *Légendes Pieuses.*"[2] Hence we observed before that, besides Dr. White and Pascal, we have Maury on our hands—three entire pages!

We owe Dr. White much. Possibly, the obligation is reciprocal, and he owes us something. But among our obligations to him, we are happy to signalize this little revelation of where he picked up his singular theory about St. Francis Xavier's miracles. The mad idea is Maury's! It may be that of a dozen other mad infidels; but clearly

1 *The Catholic World,* Oct., 1891: "Dr. A. D. White on St. Francis Xavier's Gift of Tongues;" pp. 28–32.

2 White's *Warfare,* etc., ibid. p. 25.

Maury is one of them. And our Cornell ex-historian has picked up his idea there!

But, first, let us despatch Joseph Acosta. This missionary, writing in Peru, 12,000 miles away from the scene of St. Francis Xavier's recent labors, had heard so much of the Saint's feats in dealing with nations of a hundred different languages, that, speaking of what can be done in overcoming the difficulties of language, if only there is "an ardent love for Christ, if there is industry, and if labor supplies what is wanting to nature," he gives expression to his West Indian sentiments on what he has heard of the East Indies, and says: "In this matter, there is the admirable example of Father Francis Xavier, who devoted himself with such zeal and toil to learning the Malabar tongue, and so much again in learning the Japanese and others widely different from one another, that, if he had been endowed with the apostolic gift of tongues, he could not have spread the name of Christ with more glory in such a vast region of the world."[1] With the habitual reserve of all the contemporary Jesuits, who were too cautious as learned men to make pronouncements until they were certain of their subject, and too wise as Catholics to prejudice the great missionary's standing at Rome by hasty and indiscreet assertions, this far-off missionary used just what he knew and no more. It remained for the courts to place the investigation on the double legal basis, which Benedict XIV. fixes so precisely for the question of the Gift of Tongues, and which he illustrates by the case of St. Francis Xavier.[2] The double basis is: first, the impossibility of the person's having learnt the languages in any natural way; secondly, that, in spite of his not having learnt them by any human means, he certainly showed himself skilled in them, so as to use them on occa-

1 Jos. Acosta, *De Natura Novi Orbis*, etc., lib. i., cap. ix., p. 156. Cologne edition, MDXCVI.—We have treated the whole question of Jos. Acosta in our previous article on "Dr. A. D. White's Legend about St. Francis Xavier."

2 *Benedict XIV., on Heroic Virtue*, vol. iii., p. 226–7; New York and London, Oratorian Series, 1852.

sion. As we have discussed all this matter before, we do not pause upon it again here.[1]

Now we come to Dr. White's brilliant and original argument, that of the "devil's advocate" three centuries ago. He rehearses statements regarding Xavier's Gift of Tongues from the biographers, who, he takes care not to observe, founded their statements on the juridical processes. He says they are all "directly contradicted" by the "plain statements of Xavier himself, and various incidental testimonies in the letters of his associates." Our readers will be amused on hearing, or reading for themselves in Dr. White's book,[2] that "the plain statements of Xavier himself" consist in "constantly dwelling upon his difficulties with the various languages of the different tribes among whom he went." In other words, the preliminary condition for receiving the Gift of Tongues and exercising it upon occasion disproves, according to Dr. White's logic, that he ever received the gift, which was called for by his helpless condition; and the existence of which was proved, generically, by what he actually performed in ten years, and, specifically, by the whole series of ear-witnesses! This is what is called logically an *ignoratio elenchi*, slipping the question, or not understanding what he is talking about. As to "associates," whose "testimonies" he cites, he cites none of them, nor their testimonies; unless he calls Tursellini, who wrote forty-two years after Xavier's death, "an associate." In this case his "wavering" idea of "contemporary" is very liberal indeed, more so than we had extracted from the Doctor on a former occasion. Now he comes to Acosta.

He says: All this is "directly contradicted," by "the explicit declaration of Father Joseph Acosta. The latter historian dwells especially on the labor which Xavier was obliged to bestow on the study of the Japanese and other languages"—of course, Acosta dwells on nothing of the kind, as we have just seen in the quotation—"and," continues Dr. White, "[Acosta] says, 'Even if he had been

1 *The Catholic World*, as above. 2 P. 19.

endowed with the apostolic gift of tongues, he could not have spread more widely the glory of Christ.'" [1]

Is that all? Not another word! But, the "explicit declaration?" Not a word! He has finished with the Gift of Tongues. Is this another "express acknowledgment" from "silence," like that of Dr. Douglas' and Dr. White's on St. Francis Xavier's miracles? Not another word! Yes, he goes on: "It is hardly necessary to attribute to the orators and biographers generally a conscious attempt to deceive." Exactly, Doctor! It is hardly necessary to attribute to you the conscious effort to deceive. The reader can do his part without any attributions from us.

Meanwhile, there was weighing all the time upon the Doctor's genial bosom that dead weight of legal proceedings at Rome, whereof we had given him a pretty full account. He had not touched the question any more in the new edition than in the old one; but, to punish us for the bad temper we betrayed in a moment of pardonable excitement, he completed his little bit of a note, by giving the exact paging of Alfred Maury, "pages 4–7." So, with a heavy heart, we open Maury.[2]

This new acquaintance, from the *côterie* of the ex-historian of Cornell University, is a Voltairian infidel, a light-minded rationalist, whose heroes are "in England, Locke; in France, the whole school of Voltaire; in Germany, Lessing and Kant";[3] and to these he has added himself for the respectful worship of our American ex-historian. He has joined in the merry race of hunting down all the Saints in the Middle Ages, and he undertakes to show a basis of rational "criticism," on which the vast literature of all that

1 White's *Warfare*, etc. vol., ii., p. 21.

2 *Essai sur les Légendes Pieuses du Moyen-Age*, ou examen de ce qu'elles renferment de merveilleux, d'après les connaissances que fournissent de nos jours l'archéologie, la théologie, la philosophie et la physiologie médicale; par L. F. Alfred Maury, membre de la Société royale des antiquaires de France, etc., etc. "Fallit te incautum pietas tua:" Virgile, Paris, 1843, pp. i.–xxiv., 1–305.

3 Introduction, p. xviii.–xix.

is saintly, supernatural and miraculous, may be reduced to something that a man like him can understand.[1] He begins his arduous work with a psychological study: "Let us represent to ourselves now," says the genius, "what was almost always the case at that epoch, a monk composing the life of a saint." Of course, the monk had nothing to go by; he knew nothing; he had only one idea, that of making a Saint! What will be the first edge, by which this idea will enter into execution? It will be by taking "his Divine Master," and copying Him—"a copy so much the more faithful as his enthusiasm was more live or his ignorance of the history of the saint more blank. In part dupe of an illusion, he invested in the colors of the Gospel recital the facts which, as handed him by tradition [regarding the saint to be manufactured], offered traits of resemblance more or less vague with the facts of the Gospel. Such ought to be (*telle devait être*) the fashion of writing the life of a saint, in those times of profound ignorance and darksome piety (*d'ignorance profonde et de ténébreuse piété*"). How can we deny it? he goes on to exclaim; that is the way biographies are made up now! Then he pursues this "first redaction" of the life of a saint, till it evolves into a splendid "legend properly so called; and new traits of resemblance were added between the saint and Christ." —The gentle reader will please observe that we are quoting Alfred Maury, not Dr. White; otherwise he might be misled by the traits of resemblance betwixt one and the other.

Then this rationalistic brain appends a sage note, about something that "adds," says he, "to the verisimilitude of our explanation." Then he goes back to his wise text. He says: "It is difficult otherwise to assign another cause to this curious fact (of the saint's likeness to Christ), than that which we are about to develop." He says he will not be too despotic in imposing his system on his reader, and in this he is a decided improvement on his posterity in the direction of

1 Preface, p iii.

Cornell; and he adds with frank liberality: "We will leave the reader free to discern in the facts, which we will not examine, the possibility of adapting this kind of explanation to their rational criticism," *dans les faits que nous n'examinerons pas!*[1] He examine facts! not he! He is as wise as his American posterity in this very delicate matter of facts. Then he appends a profound note, referring—not to facts—but to some "very good remark of Strauss," *Vie de Jésus*, etc. The blood of the clan is very thick among this tribe of infidels.

But we must pause. We have already reached the end of page 7 in Maury. And Dr. A. D. White referred us to "pages 4-7:" "For some very thoughtful remarks as to the worthlessness of the testimony to miracles presented during the canonization proceedings at Rome, see Maury, *Légendes Pieuses*, pp. 4-7;" and so he rid himself of our importunity on the value of juridical proceedings. There is nothing in Maury's text. In Maury's notes there is in one place the remark, that miracles were one of the conditions of canonization. In another place, he objects to himself "the imposing authority of testimony;" and says that "proofs from testimony are not wanting to attest all the monstrous fables of the life of saints, and yet what reasonable spirit would admit them to-day!" He expects us to believe his own testimony instead. There is a third note, in which he speaks of a *formule d'usage*, a formula of custom employed with regard to a saint newly canonized; that is to say, the affirmation of a saint's having wrought miracles must be considered as "a formula of custom rather than a literal relation of the facts." But where are the "very thoughtful remarks as to the worthlessness of the testimony to miracles presented during the canonization proceedings at Rome," in view of which very thoughtful remarks Dr. White was dispensed from answering us?

There is not a single word. Dr. White has played us an unpleasant trick in giving us his card of introduction to such

1 Maury, ibid, pp. 4-7.

an idiot as Maury. If Maury had made remarks, he was not worth the card or the introduction. Now, that he has none, Dr. Andrew Dickson White, ex-professor of history in Cornell University, ex-minister to Russia, and now returned to his former post as Ambassador to Germany, may take his idiot back with his card, and keep both.

## §4.

The fourth and last canon of historical criticism which we will take the trouble of presenting to this historian of the *Warfare of Science with Theology*, is to look palpable evidence in the face, without flinching, or even wincing—unless it be that this is expecting too heroic an exercise of virtue from human nature, placed in his position.

We summoned him to look at the standing miracle of Xavier's body, incorrupt at present in the city of Goa, and exhibited every ten years for the inspection of thousands and tens of thousands. He has in his hands, and he quotes, two books which suffice for showing the pertinence and significance of our challenge. One is Emanuel Acosta's collection of Indian letters, which the Doctor has extolled so much, to the exclusion of every other collection. The other is Cardinal Del Monte's speech in 1622, delivered in presence of Pope Gregory XV., from which the Doctor has taken a whole page of his text. Now, from the reverse of folio 90 of the Doctor's copy of Emanuel Acosta, on to folio 93, there is a most interesting account in the letter of Arias Blandonius, dated Goa, 9 Kal. January, 1554, of the double burial, twice in quicklime, to which the body of St. Francis Xavier had been subjected since his death two years before; and of the condition in which the body remained, till its arrival at Goa, in the sixteenth month after the Saint's death.[1] But as this account is too long for us here, we must content ourselves with only the main features of the miracle, as summarily

1 The Dilingen edition of Acosta's *De Japonicis Rebus Epistolarum Libri*, iiii., 1571, as cited by Dr. White, p. 11, note.

traced by Cardinal Del Monte, and put by him in the first place among the "Miracles after Death."[1]

Omitting the incidents, how the Portuguese merchants, happening to be on the island of San Chan, desired to take the Saint's body with them, but, as they did not wish to carry a corpse, buried the body in quicklime; and then, to their astonishment, when it was time to set sail, found the body and clothes alike intact, and even then hesitated; his Eminence states the main circumstances: That the body was buried in the earth in a wooden box, with quicklime; to the end that, all the flesh being consumed, the bones might be carried to India. Four months later the box is dug up, opened, and the lime being removed, the body is found entirely without any sign of corruption, just as if it had been buried then; the color fresh, the flesh supple, the clothing untouched. Lime is again put into the same box and the body is carried to Malacca, where it is found entire as before. Taken to the church of Our Lady on the Mount, the lime is removed, and the body is placed in a new casket. But the new casket was so short, that the remains had to be compressed somewhat and bent, which all at once caused blood to flow from the shoulders. There it lay till the ninth month after death; and when the sepulchre was opened, the body was found to be just as intact after lying in the ground as it had been after lying in quicklime; and the veil, with which the face had been covered, was stained with fresh blood, on account of the weight of earth thrown in and pressed down in the burial. Then it was splendidly laid out in a new casket, adorned with silk and gold, and was carried, first to Cochin, and afterwards to Goa. When the wonderment and devotion of the people had been satisfied to some degree, during three whole days, "as the miracle surpassed belief, an eminent physician by order of the viceroy inspected and examined the body, and found it incorrupt, full of the vital fluids (*succosum*) and supple, with

1 *Relatio facta in Consistorio*, etc., Insulis, 1622, as quoted by us before; p. 42–3.

the intestines entire and solid, whence through a small wound inflicted there issued blood; and there was no sign of balsam having been used, or oil. The remains were now placed in a special sepulchre to the right of the high-altar. Afterwards, the Vicar-General of Goa and the inquisitor general opened the tomb again, experimented on it (*pertentarunt corpus*) twice and thrice; and found all perfectly incorrupt.[1] The Cardinal then passes on to the second of the miracles after death, which accompanied the previous one; it was that of the sweet odor issuing all the while from the remains.

This is the fact to which we had challenged the Doctor's attention. We had not given the particulars, as we did with the Gift of Tongues; but we were emphatic enough. We had spoken of it under the head of "matters of palpable fact before his eyes; as, for instance, that of the body remaining incorrupt to-day at Goa, which fact is recorded in every one of the documents and authors ostentatiously paraded by him—a fact which is a miracle of the first order, alone sufficient to make everything else credible regarding St. Francis Xavier."[2] We had turned round to taunt him again: "Why does he not take account of the contemporary documents regarding the actual miracle going on of St. Francis Xavier's body remaining incorrupt at Goa, subject to inspection and verification?"[3]

In his new edition, the learned Doctor just happens to bethink himself in one place, in a note, of this irrelevant little matter. After flourishing his great edition of Joseph Acosta, and winding up his other accounts from the side of the West Indian missionary, he recovers as from a fit of abstraction, and says in quite a tone of indifference: "Since writing the above, my attention has been called to the alleged miraculous preservation of Xavier's body claimed in sundry letters contemporary with its disinterment at San Chan and reinterment at Goa."[4] This, of course, and as usual, was not what

1 Ibid. 2 *Catholic World*, Sept. 1891, p. 843. 3 Ibid., p 848.
4 White's *Warfare*, etc., vol. ii., p. 10, 11, note.

his attention was called to at all: "alleged," "sundry letters," "contemporary." Well, partial though it be, we shall be content with it; for it will show off Dr. White and the fourth canon of our historical criticism. He then spins out an interminable note. He says: "There is no reason why this preservation need in itself be doubted." That is very good; and, remember, after being buried twice in quicklime, and again in the earth, and being found to bleed even at Goa, sixteen months after death! The Doctor is more accessible to evidence than we had given him credit for. But, lo! he continues: "and no reason why it should be counted as miraculous. Such exceptional preservation of bodies has been common enough in all ages, and, alas for the claims of the Church, quite as common of pagans or Protestants as of good Catholics." Rather hard this—and poor quicklime! He goes on: "One of the most famous cases is that of the fair Roman maiden, Julia, daughter of Claudius, over whose exhumation at Rome, in 1485, such ado was made by the sceptical scholars of the Renaissance." Then, after doting on his "fair Roman maiden" for some time, he flies off to Stade, in Hanover, where "in June of the year 1895, there was unearthed the 'perfectly preserved' body of a soldier of the eighth century." He has not verified it, as usual; but he quotes; and we shall see in a moment the unimpeachable authorities of this learned historian, who is punctiliously strung with the nerves of the very highest kind of historical criticism. He says, "he might mention" bodies preserved at Strasburg; cases of "adipoceration" in various American cemeteries, which, he remarks with wonderful discernment, "never grow less wonderful by repetition from mouth to mouth and in the public prints." Then he does condescend to take one look askance at St. Francis Xavier, at the "especial caution" with which evidence should be received; and he flies off incontinently to "the touching fidelity of disciples;" to St. Charles Borromeo at Milan; to St. Augustine in Africa; to a peacock there; to Sir John Mandeville and iron and the Dead Sea; to feathers there; to St. Simon Stylites living on his pillar in Egypt; to Louis Veuillot and the

"parfum de Rome." Then immediately he subjoins: "For the case of Julia, see the contemporary letter . . . ; for the case of Stade (in Hanover), see press dispatch from Berlin in newspapers of June 24, 25, 1895."

All this is overpowering. We would respectfully say to the gentleman: The question is about St. Francis Xavier's body, buried originally twice in quicklime, buried then in the earth, found bleeding and supple two years after, preserved and visible to-day. The question is not about Julia or the African peacock; not merely about three hundred years ago, nor ten hundred years ago; nor about anything reported "in the press dispatch,—see newspapers." Newspapers! The gentleman has forgotten his discreet observation in the self-same note, about stories which "never grow less wonderful by repetition from mouth to mouth and in the public prints!" Newspapers the authority of an ex-historian of Cornell University, amid the blaze of higher criticism at the end of the nineteenth century, when a man will not accept even eye-witness and ear-witness! And what do the newspapers say about using quicklime as a means of preserving bodies, fresh and supple and bleeding? Flying to the "fair Roman maiden Julia" for help—is it not like that other performance of flying to Pascal for help?

We might perhaps be trespassing on the Doctor's classic qualifications and on his patience, if we quoted here another pagan, besides Julia. Martial has something to say about all this. He complains that he has brought a case of three kids, which were stolen from him; and he has committed the case to an advocate; but the advocate, instead of talking about the three kids, flies off to Cannae, to Mithridates and to the African war, to Sylla and to Marius and to Mucius:

Magna voce sonas manuque tota—
Jam dic Postume de tribus capellis!

"With thundering voice and frantic gestures you rant about all these things.—Now say a word, Postumus, about my three little kids, do!"

Hoc judex sibi postulat probari.

"This is what the court is waiting for."

Here then we part company for the while with this work on the Warfare of Science with Theology. We expect confidently that the REVIEW will not forget the pleasant companionship it has enjoyed with so interesting a subject; and that it will take occasion again to cement its friendship by returning with its best compliments, and doing full justice to so new and entertaining an acquaintance.

With the whole genus of the Maurys and other Postumi before our view, we close our part by observing what they are all about. They go their way with their blushing honors thick upon them, with books, big and little, marshalled before them; and they strive, with the best of the powers that are in them, to quench all light of religion from young and unformed minds or from old and ill-formed minds. And they succeed the better in doing so, the more limited and shallow is the fluid inconsistency of learning and ability, which washes their own barrenness. Their blood-money comes in; and they want more of it; and they write more articles or books, with the *auri sacra fames*. They die as they lived, upon a heap of gold; and, as they say they came from a bestial evolution, so they degenerate into a bestial dissolution.

Meanwhile, nothing escapes their touch, which carries defilement with it, like pitch. That Maury, for instance, whom our ex-professor of Cornell mentions with such distinguished regards, cannot keep his foul fingers from soiling with their touch of infamous impurity the holiest persons who have adorned the annals of humanity; nay, in the same breath he conveys his contagion in a direction holier still. The class of men to which he belongs, turning as they do with the adroitness of apostacy to assault the home of their fathers, have a tact for stinging the noblest instincts of our nature with the subtlety and cleverness of the snake in the grass. They can bite, where the dull sense of another class sees nothing special to nip; and who are too ignorant of all religion ever to have been apostate.

This latter class thrives at present in America. It has not the subtler tact of the decomposed European. Hence

the coarse and gross blasphemy, the dull and almost unconscious impiety, which characterize many American publications. But, if American, possibly it is the better adapted to the American propagandism of impiety and vice. Hence, just as if it were the subtler European impiety in Europe, must we regard with no less attention the American product in America.

204
H874

63441

Hughes, Thomas

AUTHOR

Dr. White on the Warfare of

TITLE

Science with Theology.

| DATE DUE | BORROWER'S NAME |
| --- | --- |
| | STORAGE - CBPL |
| | |
| | |
| | |

63441